

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



141 183

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America seeks the increase of understanding and appreciation between the peoples of the Americas. It works for the creation of a public sentiment in the United States sensitive to the moving forces in Latin America and concerned with the furthering of relations of mutual respect and friendship. Its program is concentrated on the leaders of public opinion through the annual Seminars in Mexico and the Caribbean. Its members are united in the belief that there are no more important aspects of our international relations than those which have to do with the republics of Latin America.

THE GENIUS OF MEXICO

Lectures Delivered before the Fifth

Seminar in Mexico, 1930

EDITED BY

HUBERT C. HERRING

AND

KATHARINE TERRILL

THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL RELATIONS
WITH LATIN AMERICA
NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1931, BY
THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURAL RELATIONS
WITH LATIN AMERICA

FOREWORD

The annual "Seminar in Mexico" is a venture in international understanding. Its success is made possible by the generous cooperation of a host of friends—speakers, leaders of discussion, interpreters—to whom we express our sincere appreciation.

Our relations with Latin America are of fundamental importance, ethically, commercially, culturally. The fabric of understanding is of fragile stuff. It is woven of the moods of peoples as well as of their minds. It may be marred by careless words as effectively as by bullets. Its destroyers may be the wanton or the heedless. During the next twenty-five years it will be decided whether the people of the Americas are to live together in mutual respect and coöperation, or in suspicion and recurrent strife. Mexico furnishes the touchstone whereby our relations to Latin America are to be tested. Mexico is our next neighbor. If our relations with Mexico can be firmly established upon a basis of mutual appreciation and respect, we shall have gone far toward establishing the enduring peace of the Americas.

H. C. H.

K. T.

*112 East 19th Street
New York City
January 2, 1931*

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE GENIUS OF MEXICAN LIFE.... <i>Moisés Sáenz</i>	
I. THE CONTRAST	3
II. STRIFE	13
III. THE QUEST FOR UNITY.....	22
II. THE INDIAN HERITAGE	
SOCIAL FORCES IN MEXICAN LIFE..... <i>Ramón Beteta</i>	33
THE INDIAN AS I KNOW HIM..... <i>M. Topchevsky</i>	46
THE INDIAN HERITAGE..... <i>Pablo González Casanova</i>	47
THE LEGENDS OF MEXICO..... <i>Rafael Heliodoro Valle</i>	58
III. THE ART OF THE INDIAN	
THE INDIAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE CULTURE OF THE UNITED STATES	<i>Mary Austin</i> 71
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FOLK ART AND SOPHIS- TICATED ART	<i>Mary Austin</i> 78
MEXICAN POPULAR ART.....	<i>René d'Harnoncourt</i> 83
MEXICAN PAINTING.....	<i>Diego Rivera</i> 88
FOLK ARTS OF GUATEMALA.....	<i>Carlos Merida</i> 95
THE MUSIC OF MEXICO.....	<i>Carlos Chávez</i> 104
IV. EDUCATION IN MEXICO	
THE FEDERAL PROGRAM OF EDUCATION... <i>Rafael Ramírez</i>	111
HIGHER EDUCATION IN MEXICO..... <i>Pedro de Alba</i>	123
THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE STUDENT <i>Efraín Brito Rosado</i>	127

V. RELIGIOUS FORCES.

PAGE

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH *Rev. Dr. Miguel Darío Miranda* 133PROTESTANTISM IN MEXICO *Dr. Victoriano D. Báez* 146

VI. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Antonio Espinosa de los Monteros 154

THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF MEXICO

Chester Lloyd Jones 161

VII. THE AGRARIAN AND LABOR SITUATION

THE AGRARIAN MOVEMENT IN MEXICO

Antonio Díaz Soto y Gama 177

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEXICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

Frank Tannenbaum 185MEXICAN LABOR MOVEMENT TODAY . . . *Ricardo Treviño* 187

PRESENT STATUS OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED

STATES *Rev. Frederic Siedenburg* 190

VIII. SOCIAL PROBLEMS

THE ANTI-ALCOHOL CAMPAIGN *Rafael Ramtrea* 197NEW PENAL LEGISLATION IN MEXICO . . . *José Almaraz* 208

IX. MIGRATION

NATIONAL BORDERS *Paul U. Kellogg* 221MEXICAN IMMIGRATION *Paul U. Kellogg* 232MEXICANS IN TEXAS *Annie Clo Watson* 235MEXICANS IN CALIFORNIA *James H. Batten* 241

CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
IMMIGRATION CONTROL THROUGH THE CONSULAR SERVICE <i>George H. Winters</i>	244
TEMPORARY MEXICAN IMMIGRATION <i>Manuel Gamio</i>	248
X. STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEXICO <i>Aarón Sáenz</i>	255
XI. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO	
A LATIN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE <i>Roberto A. Esteva Ruiz</i>	265
THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND IMPERIALISM <i>Vicente Lombardo Toledano</i>	272
THE MONROE DOCTRINE—A DEFENSE <i>Chester Lloyd Jones</i>	277
THE FUTURE OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE. <i>Samuel Guy Inman</i>	283
THE BASIS FOR UNDERSTANDING <i>Salvador Urbina</i>	288
ETHICS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW <i>Florence E. Allen</i>	301
XII. A SUMMARY AND AN INTERPRETATION.	
THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE REVOLUTION. <i>Carleton Beals</i>	313
THE FINE ART OF UNDERSTANDING . . . <i>Hubert C. Herring</i>	327

I

THE GENIUS OF MEXICAN LIFE

MOISÉS SÁENZ, educator; university training, Columbia and the Sorbonne; former assistant secretary of the Ministry of Education; author with Herbert I. Priestley of "Some Mexican Problems"; director of the Beneficencia Pública, Mexico, D. F.

THE GENIUS OF MEXICAN LIFE

MOISÉS SÁENZ

I. CONTRAST

I HAVE just returned from a trip to the United States. This time I spent three weeks traveling from Mexico-conscious San Antonio and Spanish-loving California, to Puritan Oregon. I saw the Texans, the Nordic variety, tall, lean and dreamy, a race unto themselves. I met the true, dyed-in-the-wool Americans of California garbed in the soft cloak of the Spanish manner it has been their whim to adopt. In southern California, I saw Mexico and heard Mexico, although, curiously, I can never really feel my country in that second largest of Mexican cities, Los Angeles. In Oregon, I re-encountered the spirit of the New Englander which I had lost years ago in Boston. I met him here, a little weary perhaps, and more mellow, after his trek across the continent. Here and there, I had fleeting glimpses of the Indian world; at the public market of Eugene, Oregon, I found a woman selling Navajo blankets; in Yuma I saw a dozen squaws sitting placidly under a broiling sun, mutely offering the tourist their humble handicraft.

Plenty of variety and contrast are afforded the traveler in the United States. And yet, no matter how sharply his senses may be attuned to the different and the unique, the impression he receives is one of uniformity rather than of variety. Everywhere I was confronted with the standard, the standard in language, in morals, in material

comforts, in food. I traveled in standard trains running on standard time, with standard equipment. I was the beneficiary of the standard service of the professional servants. In all the cafeterias of all the towns I visited, I enjoyed food of standard appearance and of standard quality. In every city where the train stopped long enough, I bought a paper which always looked the same and which, somehow, always read the same. There were the same motion picture houses, over-ornate, 70 degrees cool, with their incredibly attired ushers and their syndicated programs. And apparently all the one hundred and twenty millions of Americans listen to Amos 'n' Andy from 6:40 to 7 P. M.

As it is in the material, so it is in the spiritual. For no matter what the differences in source and in environment, in tradition, and no matter how varied the raw human material may have been in the past, the American stamp, the American ideology, the American standard is now everywhere apparent. America has conquered her environment. She has created her world. It is, to be sure, a growing and dynamic world, but it seems to follow well-defined lines of development. Either from fear or for efficiency's sake, she has rejected the variant and has made certain that this world be dominated by a convenient and readily imposed standard of quality. The more stubborn variants, the Negro and the Indian, are problems only in a philosophical sense, for, by shutting one up in reservations and by ignoring the other, America has practically excluded them from her universe. If they share the national life with the rest, as indeed to a degree they must, despite the limitations placed on them, it must be on the basis of the general standard and conventional law. By the application of a common standard America is on the road to historical greatness.

This little introduction may serve to emphasize the fact that, in Mexico, contrast, extremes of life and variation from the norm, are still the rule. We have only partly subjugated our physical environment. Our ethnic elements are only partially assimilated and the Mexican standard is at best only a Mexican ideal. Life in Mexico, when seen from the surface by the casual observer, is dislocated, our world chaotic. Deeper knowledge may bring a sense of fundamental unity, but the first impression is rather one of a diversity that acknowledges no pattern.

Geographically, Mexico is a concentration which a glance at the map makes plain. The continent, vast and wide at the north, suddenly narrows down under the encroachments of two oceans to a mere bridge at Tehuantepec. As the land narrows, the mountains converge. Southern Mexico is a rocky labyrinth where the fury of wind, water, and internal fire has broken the backbone of the sierra just enough to make it more awesome and imposing. In the north, we get a touch of America's western prairie and a good deal of her southwestern deserts, although once crossing the border into Mexico the traveler will be forever encircled by a horizon of purple mountains. Beyond the Isthmus, as if to add contrast, flat, jungle-covered Yucatan emerges from the tropical seas. Deep ravines and impassable canyons cut unmercifully into the broad and high central plateau where most of Mexico lives. Land on end, a tumbled down world, unfinished to look at and yet firmly set. Night falls upon the day ere a twilight is born. Rain comes suddenly and goes suddenly. Land of eternal spring this has been called, but we know no spring. Life comes upon death and death upon life without rhythm, in constant flow. The Mexican dreamer cannot lie under a tree and invite his soul. Impossible. The fields are littered with the debris of death which life has had no time to clean.

A land of eternal spring, indeed, only in a poetical sense, for, as a matter of fact, we enjoy and suffer all the climates listed in our school geographies, from the torrid, humid heat of the tropical low lands, the temperate zone of the mountain flanks and central plateau, to the frosty cold of the highlands. And, sometimes, we get all these at once. The mountain peasant grows his coffee and bananas at the bottom of the canyon, his maize on the slopes near his hut, and at the top a little barley and some apples. Many a weary traveler in the mountains, after a long day on horseback, has enjoyed a bath in tropical waters at the bottom of the canyon, making then his last ascent for the day to spend the night under heavy blankets at the summit. The farmer prays for rain in our arid northern plains; his brother of the plateau often loses his crops because of too much rain, while in the low lands the elements forever play the game of rain and steaming cloud and rain again.

Were not ours still, to a large extent, a primitive world, these con-

ditions of environment, temperature, rainfall and topography would not be so significant. But man in Mexico has not yet subjected his physical environment to the extent to which these factors may not in themselves be preponderant. Irrigation, communication, refrigeration are not yet generally sufficient to counteract natural conditions. And perhaps man in Mexico is not so interested in the control of the physical environment as the people of other countries. Perhaps we feel, ourselves, a part of the environment. Perhaps we share with some of the Oriental races the pantheistic feeling of identification between man and his world, between God and his universe. For this reason, perhaps, we are not so eager as the American of the North for the control of the material environment. There may exist a more subtle and more satisfactory kind of control. I refer to the power of understanding and of kinship. We are the children of our earth. In this spot we were born and grew and are buried. The earth is ours on the condition that we stay on it and we work it. In the words of Nezuahualcoyotl: "The land belongs to him that works it with his hands." Brown earth which we can mold with our hands. Brown mud to build and to create. We can read the heavens for rain or hear the stamping of the horses' hoofs. The sunsets and the circles around the moon have a message for us and the Nahuatl forever utters prophecy. The lean years and years of plenty we know. The science of the control of our surroundings we may not possess but the folklore of our world we have and how rich it is!

The people spring from the soil. Men of the desert in arid Mexico, spare, lean and restrained. The squatty Otomi of the hard hills of Guanajuato and Hidalgo, how firmly his feet cling to the unyielding soil, how much a part of the landscape of *cacti* and century plants he seems to be. The easy going man of the hot lands, how finely he has struck rest and equilibrium, how well he knows the secret of contentment.

We should not, however, generalize too precisely upon this 'quiescent aspect of life. Man in Mexico, like man in the United States, is not static. If the Indian in us is stolid and contemplative, we also feel in our veins the urge of the Spanish *conquistador* and pioneer. In spite of the insight and understanding of the physical world in which we live, we realize that in many regions of Mexico man is play-

ing a losing game with the environment. But this realization and the changes which it must necessarily bring about only add to our world of contrast. Were we altogether of a contemplative and pantheistic turn of mind or, again, were we entirely of the school of action, our situation would be less complicated because of the simplicity of aim. As it is, both the East and the West stir within us. As we regard our physical world, one day we feel like children of this earth, non-determinant atoms of the universe, and we would be quiet; on the next day we feel like masters, we wish to command and to control. Much of our folklore is a rationalization of our incapacity to subjugate environment.

Ethnically, Mexico was "a concentration." The two great migratory streams of people, the mound builders of the east and the cliff dwellers of the west, that for centuries had been advancing south, finally met on the balmy plateau and there they settled. Natural growth, curiosity, the desire for adventure sent these people still further on, to the southeastern shores, to the smiling northwest, to repellent tropical Mexico and Central America. We can trace the travels of these peoples, following their watering places, following the places where salt could be found, following what the ethnologist calls the natural lines. We can thus follow the course of the Mayas by the eastern coast, flanking the mountain range, evolving agriculture, enriching their life, becoming more expressive and more refined and finally, building the First Mayan Empire in southern Mexico and Central America and the Second Empire in Yucatan, creating a brilliant and complex civilization second to none of those of ancient times. To the northwest of the plateau, in present-day Michoacán, the Tarascos were settling. A smiling country of rolling hills, forest and lakes was theirs and a brilliant, light-hearted manner of life these people developed, cultivating their lands and creating their arts, painting in lacquer, using fine Persian-like decoration and feather mosaic, playing wistful, fragile music, expressing themselves in a rapid, rippling, twittering language.

From the central north came the Aztecs. They traveled south, following divine command. They, too, grew and created a unique culture pattern. Builders of massive pyramidal temples, engineers rather than architects, they were inquisitive as well as acquisitive, warlike,

dynamic. In the Valley of Mexico they found a people of craftsmen and artisans, the refined Toltecs. The Aztec managed to assimilate this group as they were also successful in extending their empire far beyond the central highland, into Oaxaca where the Zapotecs lived, and into Central America. All the known world finally became Aztec.

But to the Aztec conquest meant compromise as much as domination. The Aztec empire became simply a mosaic of culture patterns. An ethnologist, within recent years, has attempted to draw a map of Mexico showing the cultural migrations and the cultural mixtures. The result was a picture where all the colors of his scheme both blended and contrasted as cultures in the past came into one another, assimilated, interchanged, repelled. With the Aztecs, once the material conquest was assured and the tribute exacted, tribute which was of poetical and sentimental rather than of practical value, the conquered people could go on living their old life. Culture thus became within the great empire a local or, at most, a regional matter. Variation and contrast were once more the predominant note.

Mexico is strewn with the remains of ancient civilizations. There is a catalogue listing some four thousand archaeological ruins in this country and I am of the opinion that the number of such monuments existing is much larger. Visual proof of the varied character of these remains, of their wide divergence in time and in nature, may be obtained by a day's visit, first, in nearby Tlalpan, to the archaic pyramid of Cuicuilco, believed by some to be the oldest existing monument built by human hands. Go then to Teotihuacán and see the three epochs there represented in stone—the pyramid of the sun, archaic, the beautiful Toltec temple of Quetzalcoatl, and the geometrical citadel of the Aztecs. End by visiting the pyramid of Tenayuca, fifteen miles to the north of the Capital, a temple of the late Aztec period.

This variety persists to our own day. In Oaxaca, or Michoacán, or Guerrero, or Puebla, wherever the accident of topography has left the Indian more or less undisturbed, the miniature world in each little village has persisted. A world of its own, self-contained and self-sufficient. Language, dress, handicraft and recreation, all are individual and the entire country presents a living panorama of peoples and cultures.

Nor is this contrast confined only to the isolated and primitive.

In the physical appearance of the people, in their bold use of color, in the infinite variety of their handicraft, in the various mixture of the speculative and of the practical within every man, the curious paradoxes of our civilization are made manifest. Tenacious localism, the contradictory senses of individuality and of community spirit, the heroic obedience of the people and their unruly turbulence, all contribute their share to the national psychology.

When Spain came to us, a new element of contrast and variation was introduced into this land of many peoples and many customs.

The recent murals of Diego Rivera in Cuernavaca and in the National Palace will represent the resulting confusion. On the one hand, the Indian, his gods, his lore, his weapons, a world aborning; on the other, the Spaniard, armed to conquer. Clash, struggle and subjugation are the next scenes and, after that, Spain ruling with a double standard over a divided world. What a contrast between the Indian and the Spaniard is there depicted and what a tragic scene the Conquest created!

When Cortés came, the Aztecs were about to evolve an alphabet. Certain of their ideograms were already phonetic symbols. But, in Spain, the Golden Century was at hand. Cervantes was soon to write his masterpiece and Lope de Vega soon to hold the stage of the Latin world. Spain was mistress of land and sea, her laws and institutions reached into all parts. With the creation of the Society of Jesus, Spanish Catholicism was indeed to become a world power. In America, Spain found local cultures and civilizations, great only if considered relatively and measured by the standard of the primitive. The social fabric was weak to the point of disintegration. Only the flame of the spirit, the sources of the inner life in this Indian world, were equal, perhaps superior, to the Spanish.

Of all the gifts of Spain to us,—the Indian world,—that of the language was the most precious. Mexico learned Spanish because she needed a voice. Besides, the new tongue was the language of God and of law. The friars and missionary fathers taught the Spanish language with zeal and efficiency, but while the linguistic conquest was remarkable, it was never complete. Even today, three millions of Indians in Mexico do not know Spanish. Instead, something like fifty indigenous languages are still spoken.

The teaching of the new religion, one of the important secondary motives of the Conquest, met receptive moods in the deeply religious nature of the Indian. Gods ruled the lives of the primitive men; they presided over the slightest actions, and the priests were counselors and guides. The life of the individual, somehow, extended into divine existence and there was always the Indian belief in a place where the human and the divine vaguely coalesced. The new religion did not have a clean slate to write itself upon. On the contrary, a firmly entrenched faith, a realistic, close-to-life mythology and a rich religious art were there to challenge. And yet, fifty years after the landing of Cortés, the Indians, or so the reports said, had all been converted to the new creed. In the first two centuries of Spanish rule, something like ten thousand churches were built. Many of the structures were constructed on the sites and with the materials of old Indian temples. Even the native wayside shrines were turned into chapels. Nevertheless, with its places of adoration destroyed and their stones used for the new altars, the old religion would not die. The missionaries had to make room for some of the old beliefs and rites and tacitly admitted, or purposely incorporated, part of the old into the new. But the Indian went even farther and, as the vigilance of the missionary during the first years disappeared, he evolved a religion without theology, a mixture of the new Christianity with his own paganism, rich in meaning. A bizarre sort of religion, this composite creation, grotesque and primitive in some respects, sensuous and realistic, in whose art the Indian everywhere crops out and in which renaissance reverts to primitive; a variegated, contradictory religion, half Christian, half pagan.

The contrast which Spain introduced into Mexico is made bolder by the fact that Spain herself was of a divided mind. She sent both the missionary and the *encomendero*. The one for the spiritual conquest and for the work of civilization, gentle, good, genial; the other vulgar and brutal and ill of that illness "that only gold can cure." After suffering the cruel attack of the soldier, the missionary must have seemed to the Indians the living image of the White God of kindness they dreamt about. He was healer and comforter to them, and a teacher. He taught them the new language, new skills. He taught them how to work their fields, how to make beautiful things

with their hands. Missionary and *conquistador*, they both set their pattern in the new Spain; they both planted their seed and for four hundred years and more the seed has been germinating.

"What are you," my friends in the United States often ask me, "Are you Spanish?" And then, for fear of hurting my feelings, they hasten to add, "Yes, of course, you are Spanish." And then, again, some people, after having heard me talk about Indian Mexico, will remark to each other, "Of course, one can see that he is a full-blooded Indian." But when answering their question I tell them that I am merely a Mexican, they do not seem to understand. And they would understand less were they to hear a dozen men, white, brown, olive, blue-eyed, brown-eyed, black-eyed, with straight hair and with curly hair and with wavy hair, say that they all each and every one were Mexicans. For, of course, one has to learn that in every part of America where Spain held sway she created a new type, the *mestizo*, this being not the least of the many remarkable contributions of Spain to the New World.

The *mestizo* is, of course, a cross, a blend and as such he must be considered as having a quality of unity rather than of contrast. But if one is trying to give a picture of all the elements that go to make the variegated Mexican conglomerate, one must point to the *mestizo* as one of the most important. Inasmuch as he is not a pure type, the *mestizo* offers infinite variation as to color and other physical traits and, to a certain extent, as to mental characteristics. Within the human picture of Mexico, as one regards the Indian and the white, the *mestizo* is equally conspicuous as a contrasting and a unifying element.

It is the *mestizo* that has created the division between northern and southern Mexico. In the north, the people are tall, energetic and businesslike; they are not easily stirred but once aroused they are likely to push to the end. The standard of living in that part of the country, north of San Luis Potosí, is at least twice as high as in the rest of the country. The people up there have less imagination and less feeling than their brothers to the south; they also have less spiritual alertness. When I go North, my thinking becomes conventional. We discuss the business situation, the market values. I am shown the material improvements of the town, the paving of the streets, the

newly completed stretch of highway. Occasionally, a person will ask about "my Indians" in a half humorous way, as if Indians were a sort of a queer hobby of mine.

South of San Luis Potosí, on the plateau and beyond, the other Mexico lives. It is a very large part of Mexico if one considers the number of people living there rather than the square miles of territory. It is a much more Indian Mexico than in the north, darker, more intense, less open. The people of the north have started and have led most of our revolutions, but from the south have come the two men who governed Mexico during almost half of her independent life, Juárez and Díaz. The people of the north have taken the social reform of the Mexican Revolution either as an inevitable evil or as a natural process of progress; for those of the south it has been a gospel. When I go visiting villages in the north, the neighbors seem to think that it is high time for the Government to do something about their schools and to hope that something really is going to be done. When I go south, the whole village comes out to welcome me, the Indian authorities will greet me at the entrance to their pueblo. Eagerly the people will follow as I make my visit, scanning my face for signs of approval, asking for my instructions as to how to carry on, eager to receive, eager to give, eager to do.

Contrast is thus the dominant note in Mexican life. Certainly it furnishes the rhythm and theme for the first movement in our symphony of life. Mexico is a land of infinite variety, of mixtures of peoples and of cultures, of the prehistoric living side by side with feudal Europe and progressive America.

Land of Huitzilopochtli, the God of evil, and of Quetzalcoatl, the God of goodness. The land of the eagle and the serpent, symbols of the flag, the land of Santa Ana and Juárez, both of them great leaders, one leading his country to perdition, the other to self-realization.

The "land of mañana" in truth, as to aspiration. The land of yesterday just as well, for tradition. In reality, the land of today, where everything exists in the present; where it is not possible to plan long ahead, where the unexpected always happens. Life is in the present as in the stories of the Aztec scrolls where past events and future happenings, history and prophecies, are items in the day's narration.

II. STRIFE

THERE is a note of tragedy in the Mexican landscape. The flat-topped, pyramidal hills seem to bear the weight of the skies. The mountains are bare and ragged, the highlands cut deep by gully and ravine. For half a year, the fields are brown, silent people walk swiftly and lightly over the dusty roads, under a pitiless sun. At sundown, the light turns purple, the mountains encircle the land with a horizon of luminous velvet. Then night closes the little drama of the day.

Death is a familiar entity in Mexico. We play with death. The season of All Saints' Day brings forth the folkloric life of the people and its creative genius as no other occasion. On All Saints' Day, we remember our dead by feasting at the cemeteries if we are in the cities, or quietly at home if we are in the villages. But on that day we also remember our friends and even our enemies still living, and have a little fun at their expense by imagining them dead and writing witty epitaphs to their memory. At this time we buy different objects suggestive of funerals, confectioned in colored sugar, and take them home to the children. A child of the cities without his skull and bones, at this festive time, would feel as forsaken as an American child without his Christmas toy.

Familiarity with death spells recklessness and a sense of fatality, two characteristic Mexican traits. The rustic troubadour bids farewell to his beloved by singing:

"Like a poor simp, I made a mistake,
Well, such is life.
Child of my heart, this time I have missed my game!
What should I care for life without honor?
For I have made a bad play.
If they are to kill or to jail me,
Let them kill me, who cares a fig?"

And the peasant soldiers in the Revolution went to the attack singing:
"If I am to die tomorrow, let them kill me right away."

This familiarity with death shows no callousness or brutality, however. It is merely the way people have of facing life without senti-

mentality. This plastic and poetic domination of death might be the expression of the very desire for life and, yet, our courting death cannot help but add a touch of the tragic to our life.

Mexico has been a battleground and the death of the body has not always been the worst calamity of the strife. The slow torturing of what has been ourselves, the pitiless shutting up of the channels of life, the inescapable drying up of the very fountains of life, this indeed, has been death even when the spent, listless bodies were allowed to exist. Repression was the great tragedy of conquered Mexico. "That your names be forgotten, that your temples be destroyed, that your gods be buried, that your scrolls and codices be burnt, that your land be no longer yours." Spain brought all the glory of Renaissance Europe, why should she think about the childish culture of the Indian? She brought life and light to the natives, why make concessions for their souls? They have no souls!

Moctezuma received Cortés with infinite courtesy; he sent messengers to him carrying presents; he made a display of his arts and his treasures; he banqueted him. When tragedy could be checked no longer, Moctezuma made his bow, "forgot that his young heart was full of dust, and, setting on his brow the level turquoise, walked with flamingo feathers down the world." His subjects understood. The look of indifference set on the masks of their own handicraft fell over their own countenances. They withdrew into themselves; forever they were silent. They ignored the conqueror; pride became humility.

I have watched with deep concern this shutting of the Indian within himself when a powerful intruder violates his integrity. In many of the villages, where to this day the Indians have been living undisturbed, the function of government is discharged by an elected council of aldermen, presided over by a president. Over this Council, a judge exerts authority and over them all, as supreme tribunal of the community, stand the elders, and principal men of the group. On the first week of each new year, families gather and the election of the authorities takes place. A number of young men of promise will be chosen to serve as *topiles*, a sort of police for the community. From those that at the end of the year have proved worthy, one will be chosen to serve in the last rank of the council of aldermen. Every year a promotion will be made, from *topil* to seventh alder-

man, to sixth, fifth and so on, until by the end of eight years the chosen one will become president. In another year he will become the judge and after that, his term finished, he will enter into the group of the law makers and supreme councilors, to remain there for life. Men are chosen on the test of service. The system is one of strict selection based on demonstrated ability.

Only one acquainted with Indian life will understand with what earnestness, with what stern sense of responsibility, the system is observed. The men selected for the highest position represent the best that the community has and they also stand as symbols of the sacred judgment and inviolate will of the community.

One day, however, the outsider comes. He is a politician. He is running for Congress and stands well with the governor of the State. He has just gained access to this heretofore forgotten territory. He finds the people so benighted that political relations with the state government do not even exist. He is determined that this condition of isolation shall cease. Incidentally, he is also determined to be elected to Congress by the district to which this village belongs. He sets to work his well developed technique of political manipulation. To begin with, he will have a suitable man appointed municipal president or judge for the time being, as a sort of emergency measure, to bring the poor villagers out of their sad condition. This man will see to it that, at the proper time, the village duly casts the exact number of votes for "the candidate." When his own turn comes, the *pro tempore* president will be elected by an overwhelming majority, to steer the ship of the little state. The popularity of the man is likely to continue as long as the candidate himself is on horseback or as long as he finds his local man useful. The Indians do not understand what all this is about (or perhaps they understand too well). What they do know is that an intruder now presides over them, that the sacred function of government has been violated and taken from their hands; that the system which for ages has been theirs, to select of their best for the highest position, has been broken. Social life has lost its meaning, responsibility is gone, civic disintegration sets in.

Defeat came without a struggle. The outsider simply put over them the top man: the rest of the machine could go on working. As a matter of fact, it must keep on functioning if pride is to be saved and

life itself is to be possible. Every new year, therefore, the families will gather and elections will be held and a council of aldermen formed which will be presided over by the boss from the outside. Life flows on, barely a ripple on the surface. But underneath, what a tragedy! What a betrayal of the sacred integrity of social life, what a shameful defeat to acknowledge to the young men growing up, what a falling down of moral values. Outwardly, life goes on. Inwardly, the rhythm is broken. To comply with the new manner of government imposed on him, the Indian accepts the foreign boss and simulates the old forms; to save his self-respect, he will go deeper into his soul. A new grievance or a new longing is born. Spiritual tension increases at the price of happiness.

Violation, desecration! As it was when the Spaniards were here, so is it now. Not many inviolate entities are now left but what there is of them may be at any time trampled on, for respect for the other man's integrity is an almost unknown virtue among us.

When Spain came, the world was virgin. On every side life was crushed, the spirit fled, the flavor and aroma of living was destroyed: government, religion, tradition, rite, a culture. But now, as we go to the Indian with our program of incorporation, of nationalization, of uplift, are we not repeating the same desecrations? Are we not as ignorant of values, as intolerant? Have we put the question to ourselves as to what the Indian has that may be worth preserving? Faint voices, indeed, are heard; evidences of collaboration between the Indian and his *mestizo* redeemer are not lacking and yet even our more enlightened and sincere efforts mean conflict and spiritual strife.

The struggle for domination has been a prominent note in Mexican history. Land of many peoples and many races and varied influences, the fittest only could survive. Primitive cultures were yielding and tolerant at times but actual clash was not prevented, for ahead of culture marched the material interests that must find satisfaction—encroachments on the choice lands, exacting tribute, capturing suitable human offerings for the gods. The Aztec was master because he was the best warrior.

After the onslaught of the *Conquistador*, which, even if cruel and brutal, was, after all, of short duration due to the weak resistance offered by the native races, conflict was of the inner life until suprem-

THE GENIUS OF MEXICAN LIFE

acy was established. But supremacy was no permanent condition, the future was always challenging. Subjugation was not domination, after all. In one hundred years, the Christianity of the Indians was creeping, in the lower clergy, its own leadership. From its ranks the man would come that some day would defy both secular and ecclesiastical power. Politically, the Spaniards born in Mexico, the creoles, would become every day more eager to wrench the rule of the country from far away Spain. As the Church became rich and powerful, it drew to itself the jealousy of the State. By the end of the 18th Century barely three hundred years after the landing of Cortés, conflict was no longer between Spain and an Indian world, but between the whites of New Spain and the Indian and the insurgent *mestizo*. Spiritual strife there always was, but it was around material entities that the struggle thickened; who could get more land, who could exert the greater power, who drew the largest revenues, who had the largest number of serfs.

The 19th Century brought about a new alignment of powers. The lowly priests finally took up the protest that three hundred years before the great missionaries had voiced, and led the overburdened masses of insurgent *mestizos* and Indians against the Spanish rule. Underdogs, all of them, priest and insurgent, trampled under the heel of the white. The Mexico-born Spaniards saw their chance and allied themselves with the insurgents against Spain. Ten years later the pact of Independence was signed, but the victory was not for the brown insurgents, but for the Mexican whites who came out masters of the country.

And then, for fifty years, the struggle for power and for liberation and self-realization was on. Setting up an ephemeral empire, creating a republic, forming a constitution, fighting the foreign invader, losing half of the country, were the events and occupations of the crowded half-century.

Debasing ambition, high ideal, heroism, dumb suffering. The future struggle of ineptitude. Death throes and travail. A people lost after three centuries of repressed living, blinded by their new light, eager to walk by themselves, yet weak and almost helpless. Within, however, a burning force that would not give them rest; the awakening of their old desires, fleeting remembrances of a lost soul, intimations of a life

be. All around, the new world created by Spain, only in part understood by the new race, largely outside the comprehension of the aboriginal native.

By the fifties, an Indian brings order to our chaos. Juárez emerges from the mountains. He came from the soil, of the people. But he was an Indian only in blood and original make-up; for the rest, he had come to the cities, he had gained an education, was imbued with the culture we possessed, our new Mexican culture. He was simply one of us. He was the embodiment of every strength there was in us, of every aspiration. He had gathered into his soul all that divine will to persist which during the past centuries had saved the people from annihilation. After the passing of Juárez, another man came, dark of color also, although much less of the Indian than Juárez. Diaz could have carried on the work of leading his people to self-realization into the light of true liberty. Instead, he created a new subjugation and a new yoke. By the close of the century, the whites were once more in power, the land had fallen into the hands of new masters. The Indian was as lost as during the worst years of Spanish rule; the *mestizo*, a free man, was made a serf. A new class was created in the country, the peon. In the city there was a new art and a new philosophy, both imported from Europe. The Capital was rebuilt on the Louis XV style; the painters were making French landscapes, the musicians were singing Tosti and Chaminade, the litterateurs were in Paris, writing reviews on French life for the Mexican newspapers. Only the youthful lyric poets remained in Mexico, their one ambition in life being that of obtaining a commission from the government to go to Paris.

The philosophy of the country was also imported; the Age of Reason was inaugurated. The Positivistic School of thought was established. We were to become thoroughly scientific. Materialism was the word, the day of the Spirit was past. Glittering prosperity was created in the cities. The intellectuals had set up a system of schooling adequate for the selection of leaders after the heart of the masters and for the formation of the ruling aristocracy. A comfortable philosophy had done away with the soul. Three hundred years before, the other whites were declaring that the people had no soul. Science did not mean the control of environment for the good of man, it meant only, with the

Científico Party that was created, a political system for the indefinite conservation of power and the exploitation of the country.

A great peace had come over the land. The Octavian peace of material force. But inside, struggle was intense and conflict was brewing, because the Indian, though forgotten and vexed, was not dead, and the *mestizo* was restless. Intimations of struggle here and there; occasionally an outburst of protest. Twelve million human beings were suffering. If one had an ear fine enough, one could hear the throbbing of their hearts. The atmosphere was highly charged. The storm was gathering.

One grievance there was, more rankling than the rest—the yearning for land. It was an old wrong. It started when the *Encomenderos* took possession of the Indians' land. It had been an uncomprehensible wrong then. To the Indian, land was one with life and with God. The native's only title to the land had been the old tenet of Nezahualcoyotl, their poet king: "The land belongs to him who works it with his hands." Man and land were a unity, labor was the connecting link. Land stood for power; therefore, it was synonymous with deity. The gods had to busy themselves with the occupations of man relating to the land. There were gods for rain and for crops and for harvests; gods of maize and gods of flowers. God, land and man, a unity. God, craft, land, belief, attitude,—a sequence never broken in the Indian's mind.

When land was taken away, and yet physical life still kept on, there was bewilderment. What had happened to their gods? Surely this deprivation was not real! When reality finally solidified, there came confusion and a bitter sense of defeat. Turmoil inside, the breaking down of the old faith. Life had been "jazzed" up, integrity defiled. The outcry was so great that even the conqueror had to make some concessions. A little land was given to the villages to be held communally by the inhabitants. The wailing was subdued but as the people grew, land hunger became a basic want.

When the Age of Reason and of Science was inaugurated by official Mexico, the policy of land deprivation knew no restraint. The Juárez law—forbidding the land holdings of the religious orders—the religious communities, so-called—was interpreted to apply to the communal holdings of the villages. Under the name of the Juárez law, the

champion of the Indians, they were deprived even of the pittance which the Spanish Crown had given them. The *hacienda* grew at the expense of the village. Free men, Indian and *mestizo*, became serfs. The villages, deprived of the valley lands, basis of their substance, were left to starve on the barren slopes of the hills. Some surrendered, came down to the feudal fortress which was the *hacienda*, entered the heavy gates into the arched courtyard, imposing, saw the major-domo, and engaged themselves as laborers. Twelve cents a day, a few grains of corn and a handful of beans, a straw mat to lie on at night. Free man of the village once, while he had owned a patch of land. A slave of the *hacienda* now, possessor only of a past and of a grievance. Crouched beneath his red *zarape*, under the stars, his back to the outer wall of the *hacienda*, the big *sombrero* hiding his wistful eyes, looking out over the valley once his own, where the shadows had now gathered, what strange torment filled his soul as though vaguely remembering a lost paradise! Had it been real, this Eden which he felt, or was it only fancy? Who knows? Who cares? Such anguish and such longings were indeed the flickering intimations of a soul the existence of which the powerful lords of evil were so insistent in denying.

In the mountains, the other people weren't faring very much better. They had escaped the claw of the land grabber, because the little land these people possessed was not worth having, and the mountain fastnesses where they lived were too remote. But the miserable patch of land was not enough. The people increased in spite of every check. Stomachs grew hungry. What they did not get of food, they had to make up somehow. Alcohol was a good friend, apathy and listlessness fitted an empty stomach. And the man of the mountain, free still under the sky, like his brother serf in the *hacienda*, at night—in the quiet of the dark hut—also remembered and grieved and felt mad impulses of revolt.

Life was repressed. By the whip and the law and the conditions first, by sheer deficiency afterwards. Physical life persisted. How tenacious the lithe bodies, how firm the limb, how resistant the material fibre! And the inner life lived, too, in dumb desire and aspiration, in longing and ideal. Gentleness persisted, and courtesy. The voice never was ruffled. Thus had Moctezuma descended the throne steps

before the conquering white. The hand went on creating. Terse, rounded pottery, refined lacquer work, weaving of intricate design or of fine restraint as befits one who knows so much; the whimsical toy, such gayly painted pigs with pink ears and blue roses on its flanks and an impertinent little tail tied up with a purple ribbon.

The *mestizo* was more outspoken. He also kept the integrity of poise and the mask of indifference but every once in a while, each time more frequently, he would burst out into a big, defiant laughter, bitter and reckless, but carefree and gay withal, and he would speak in exaggerated bravado, contradictory, and make fun of the world and of himself.

All the time, inner forces gathering, tension becoming more tense, spiritual restlessness, thunderbolts more and more frequent. When the conquering white soldier had come, the Indian withdrew into himself, putting over his face the mask of his indifference. But now the soul was coming out, excited and hopeful. There was a luminous, starved look in the eyes of men. Spiritual tension was at the breaking point. One day, an unsuspected Messiah appeared. He was a little man from the North, with dreamy eyes, who used to call the spirits at night. He felt vaguely that something had to be done; he wanted to be President. He was the son of a landed, wealthy family. He thought he would offer land to the people. His name was Francisco Inocente Madero. Inocente means "innocent." He was guileless. His enemies called him a fool.

But Indians and *mestizos* heard the offer. Land, land at last! For the first time, here was a leader after their own hearts. They flocked to his side. In a few months he was President. But just a few months more and he was slain. Then the storm that for four hundred years had been gathering broke loose.

Conflict, indeed, and strife, out on the battleground, no longer pent up within hearts. Violence and death and destruction. Blind, savage protest. The Revolution breaking down the shackles, the Revolution tearing down the temples and the false gods. The people, the underdogs fighting out their grievances, blindly following the leaders, straining their ears to listen to the voice of the prophets.

Out of this struggle and travail the soul of Mexico was born.

III. THE QUEST FOR UNITY

THE embrace of Cortés and Malinche was the beginning of a new race. From the Indian and the Spaniard came the *mestizo*; they planted the seed that in due time would give birth to Mexico. By the close of the Spanish domination the whites numbered two in proportion to the Indian's four and the *mestizo's* four. Today, the total population having doubled, the Indian has increased his proportion twofold, holding his own; the *mestizos* have increased four times their number of a century ago, while the white element has remained stationary. The coming up of the *mestizo* type is inevitable; from a biological point of view the evolution of the Mexican is an unquestionable fact. With the proportion of whites practically at a standstill, the growth of population must come about by more and more frequent crossings of Indian and *mestizo*. Indian blood is, consequently, in the ascendancy. Mexico is becoming darker.

It was the increasing number of the *mestizo*, the appearance of the Mexican on the scene, that started the movement which brought about Independence from Spain a little more than a century ago. Politically, Mexico was born in 1821. In point of fact, a Mexican soul had dwelt in the land for at least a century before that time. Friar Mendieta could write at the end of the first fifty years of the Spanish domination that, after the Indians "became Christians and saw our images . . . there is no altar, ornament or image, however beautiful it may be, that they will not reproduce and imitate. . . . Nearly all the beautiful and curious work now being done in New Spain," he adds, "is being done and finished by the Indians, because the Spanish masters of all these trades, wonderful to state, do nothing more than charge the Indians with the work, telling them how they wish it done, and the Indians proceed to do it in so perfect a manner that it could not be bettered." At first, the Indians copied, then they followed instructions; afterwards they created. As they created with their hands, the soul of Mexico was born.

Among the many arts that the Spaniards brought to New Spain was that of the glazed tin-enameled ware which they had in turn acquired from the Moors—the famous blue and white Talavera ware.

Dominican friars brought the art to newly founded Puebla where the Indians had been producing unglazed pottery for centuries. In a short time the industry had attained unusual importance and to this day it is one of the characteristic products of the region. The Indian potter followed religiously the model and instructions of his masters; his were hands trained for ages to mold the brown earth. Molding earth had been indeed the very symbol of his right to live—Earth, Man, Craft—the old sequence. The Indian artisan learned easily. The masters issued detailed regulations as to color and design, for him to follow. From his potter's wheel and his brush came out, as time went on, the imported styles, the Moresque at first, the more truly Spanish afterwards and, in turn, the Chinese. The regulations of the guild were exacting: that clay should be prepared in such and such a way, that sizes and shapes should be thus and so, that exact imitation of the Spanish ware be carried out, that imitation of the Chinese be also effected, and so on.

But soon the native worker was overstepping the regulations. Designs and styles not recognized therein began to appear. The Aztec would crop up at every daub of the brush, shapes were not altogether Hispanic. Size and decoration acquired a certain freedom and grandeur. The vast horizon of the New World, the ample sweeps of the mountains were making themselves felt. The color scheme became richer. Only five colors were allowed by the regulations but the Indian loved his siennas and golds. Above all he loved the greens of his own maize. As the guild grew careless, he became bolder; shape, size, design, color—a new creation. His own!

By the end of the 17th century, barely one hundred years after the introduction of the art, the new type could already be recognized. The new style was not Indian any more than it was Spanish or Chinese; it was all of these, with a bit of the Italian, the Dutch and the Moorish thrown in. But it was more than a mere summation of these styles. It had more force, more ambition, and a kind of geometrical solidity. It was surely a new type, the Mexican type.

And as with pottery, so with stone-carving and with building, with painting and with weaving. Two hundred years after the Spaniards came, Mexican art was on the land. For Mexico had been born, its voice was creative labor, art. Out of chaos we were bringing forth

order. Strange masters, new materials, new patterns, command, repression. The old concepts shattered; the rhythm of life broken. Mute suffering, spiritual torment, despair, bewilderment, confusion. A tragic day, a year, a century, and then, out of the hands of man came forth life, order, sweetness, light. The physical world had been set in spiritual order. Varied, contrasting, conflicting, were the elements he began with. Now he was molding with his own hands, he was creating. Earth, Man, Craft, and with them a state of soul—attitude, hope, peace. The old unity was returning. Life once more had a rhythm of its own. In creative activity, which is artistic activity, Mexico found its soul. The answer of Mexico to Spain was art.

To this day, art is our first integrity. It has been for the most an unconscious process; our integration is emotional. The art we produced was an everyday expression, unstudied, natural; it was merely a way of living. It was art only in the sense in which art is creative and re-creative activity; only in the sense in which art is emotion become plastic; only in the sense in which art is a living synthesis. And in that sense Mexican art, even if primitive and popular and dealing with the commonplace, has been a great art because it has been a great integration and a great relief.

In this everyday art the soul of Mexico is expressed. It is in the *zarape* and in the *petate* which we weave, cradle and bier; in the pottery which we make. It is in the innumerable painted miracles which hang as votive offerings in every church, a record of human suffering and racial agony which nothing short of the miraculous could relieve. The soul of Mexico speaks in the toys which we mold, carve and paint, to see and to feel more than to play with; it is evident in the plastic bread and ornate food which we eat.

When the soul evolved a body and a mind, the trouble started. Spiritual order accomplished, it became necessary to bring about material order as well. Independence from Spain seemed to be the first need. After that, for one hundred years, revolt and mutiny; law-making and law-breaking; a great impatience and a great anguish, the quest for the ideal, the ideal unattained.

Slowly the mind of Mexico is taking shape. It is of necessity a revolutionary mind, for revolution is violent change and we are bent on changing rapidly the material conditions of our life. From the

English language we have appropriated a word, "meeting." It would seem that we in Mexico cannot exist without one kind of meeting or another. A meeting means a coming together of people, discussion, agreement perhaps. A meeting calls for a leader. We also have appropriated the Anglo-Saxon word and concept, "leader." There could not be revolutions without meetings and without leaders. At the meetings leaders speak; impassioned, disorderly speeches, words without end, a torrent of ideas. Certain words are repeated interminably. "Masses" is one of them, "conglomerate," another, and "ideology" yet another. You cannot listen for five minutes to the speech of any leader without having proffered to you half a dozen "postulates." Ideology, not mere ideas but orderly ideas, principles, postulates. Can't you see that we are looking for agreement, that we are seeking like-mindedness? We want to make order in our chaos. We would like to find the ruling principle. We hunger for postulates that bind and need no proof, for the fusion of the contrasting elements in our life, for the coming together of men. We need postulates and principles to give authority, leaders to point the way, to guide.

Thinking and talking about ourselves and about our world seems to be the characteristic note of the last ten years in Mexico. Self-examination and self-appraisal. In a sense we are discovering our world. Discovering in that we are trying to think clearly about it, that we are trying to be objective and honest, and above all because we are striving to set it in a different order.

Twenty years ago, just before the Revolution, peace had settled over Mexico. But it was not a peace in the hearts of the people; rather was it only material immobility. We were like a dead sea of dark, torpid waters. The ruling class, self-satisfied, had stopped thinking; the people felt, perhaps thought, but uttered no word.

Despite the positivistic creed of which they boasted, the leaders of those times did not see our world. Instead, all kinds of pretty illusions about ourselves were current. We were rich and powerful, it seemed, heroism and patriotic fervor were commonplace virtues; the system of government was a model for the nations of the world to copy. Our people, so these men said, descendants of the great Indians of old, were strong and happy. Our system of education was the last word. Did we not have model institutions in all our capital cities;

was not our University the oldest in America; were we not following the most up-to-date European methods of teaching and studying in the latest French textbooks?

But to the young men of 1915 and of 1925 who took unto themselves the task of leading the nation after the upheaval of the Revolution, the Mexican scene was vastly different. Our material prosperity, founded upon the sweat and blood of a destitute race, but the privilege of a rarefied upper class only, became a shame and an offense. Our wealth was foreign—Spanish the land, North American the railroads, English the mines. The schools were inadequate, cold and formal. Art, to be recognized, had to have a foreign stamp. Appreciation for the tradition of Mexico had become a matter of expediency. As we made the discovery of our world, chaos once more seemed the only reality.

Passion, however, is a great synthesizer. Once the flood gates were down, in the midst of pandemonium, action, even when violent, had a single aim. Revolution in its destructive aspect, blind and passionate, inconsistent, contradictory, was the avenue of escape from chaos, our only hope of bringing about order. But the responsibility of creating an orderly world still rested upon the leaders. The organizing of the facts of our reality, the striving for a formula that should harmonize seemingly contradictory facts, the defining of our ideal—were necessary steps.

What is the Mexican reality? What is the place and the meaning of race, ownership, land, wealth, democracy? What is our political status? What is the test of true leadership? What are we? What would we like to be? What is our destiny?

It is no rhetorical expedient that prompts these questions. These are in truth the problems over which Mexico has been pondering. It may be difficult for the outside world, hearing of our revolutions and revolts during the last ten years, to realize that not fighting but thinking has been our occupation. Violent deeds are only the signs of our mental effort to fathom the truth of our reality and of our ideal. And this effort, this striving for reality is the characteristic note of life in Mexico at the present time. This is the meaning of what has been called our Intellectual Revolution.

In our frantic efforts to achieve a rational order, to build a con-

sistent ideology, to seek for principle and postulate, in short, to create a Mexican mind, we almost forgot our Mexican soul, the soul that had been created in travail and agony in generations past. But one day the artist made us remember. The professional artist this time, the conscious creator, painter, sculptor, poet and musician.

These people were the depositories of the Mexican tradition. A few of them had left the country for a time but they had returned to us; most of them were born to the new generation. What the intellectuals were finding very difficult to do, the artist did with the utmost facility. In three short years, Diego Rivera unfolds in epic murals the story of Mexico—reality and aspiration, fact and ideal; Orozco brings to memory ages of suffering and worlds of strength; Chávez fills the air with a strange music reminiscent of the Indian drum and fife, yet geometrical, strong, possessed of a new meaning, a music that stirs in us dormant chords and makes our pulse beat faster.

Where the ideologists failed, the artists succeeded. Here, on these canvases, in this music and this dancing, we were all united—one in feeling, a common acceptance of the message. Once more the artists have brought about an integration.

But the response was not at all in an appreciative consensus of opinion. We had to express this newly found integrity. Idea and action must be based on our own genius and tradition. The soul was the important factor. Once more our answer was an artist's answer. Within a short time, the artistic renaissance became a reality. The conscious artist had a new incentive to create—to create for himself and to make others create. Free schools of painting sprang up overnight, children and grown people flocked to them and poured forth the sweet essence of their souls. Ruiz opens the free schools of carving and sculpturing in stone and brings out from child and peon the old genius for working the earth with their hands. People did not have to be taught or trained in these so-called schools, all they needed was an invitation and an opportunity to express themselves.

In the meantime, the unconscious artist, our Indian and peasant artisans who throughout the Dark Ages of our history had kept their creative integrity, came into an appreciative world.

Once more, the people are creating. This time, our activity is a

more conscious process than that of old. Our Mexican soul is beginning to serve the purpose of a Mexican mind.

I recall a visit, made more than a year ago, to the small village of Estancia, near the town of Actopan in the state of Hidalgo. It was early on a Sunday morning and I was to see the people at work building the school for their village. When we came to the place, I found no village: an expanse of hilly country, hard, cactus-grown, brilliant in the morning sun with a hard glitter that almost hurt, lay before me. The regional director of education who was with me explained that we were standing on the site where the *ejidatarios* (those who had been granted land by the Agrarian law) were to build their village. The land they had received had been taken away from the *hacienda*, the house of which we could just see settled, foreboding and strong, like a small fortress, in the little valley below. The people had been living as peons on the *hacienda*; now that they had land they would build themselves a village. The first structure was to be the school; a church and a small hospital would follow.

The teacher arrived—a girl of twenty, smiling, unaffected, competent looking.

"They'll be getting here soon," she said. "First we'll have singing, afterward the 'engineer' of the *Misión* will teach them how to make bricks. See over there the oven the villagers built when they gathered last Sunday. That is where they will bake the brick. Finally they'll go to work on the school building."

The men came, some fifty of them. They seemed to have sprung from behind the century plants, so quietly had they arrived. Lads of fifteen and twenty, men of thirty, old men of indefinite age—poor, dirty, ragged. There was dignity in their manner and restraint, but a pitiful, scared and wondering sort of look in their eye was painful to see.

They gathered in a group, the teacher among them, and they sang the new songs of Mexico, which are merely the old songs that we are singing anew. Trivial songs, some of them, but those men, singing there on the slope of the hill, with bared heads, facing the rising sun, chanting with deep voices, solemn yet full of meaning, like the swelling of the tide, made of the singing a rite of consecration.

The "engineer," a member of the Rural Mission at work in the region, arrived. They mixed the clay, put it in frames, made the bricks which the following Sunday they would bake. We all went up to the top of the hill where the school was to be built. Everybody worked. Some carried rocks on their backs, others would dig, others mixed mortar and again others worked on the wall. The scene resembled a beehive—no orders, no confusion, just a spirit of silent labor, like a ceremonial act.

The school is now built—of mortar and stone. Trees have been planted, there is a patch of flowers, a bit of green alfalfa, a playground.

Somehow, Estancia stands out in my mind as the sign and proof of the synthesis for which we are striving and to a certain extent achieving. Feeling, mind, action. Men, reborn on their new land, erecting a village that begins with a school; men singing at sunrise, the longing and the sweetness of their souls; men working with their hands the land that belongs to them once more; men engaged in the accomplishment of a common purpose. Leaders who guide and enlighten—wise teachers who, although ignorant of pedagogy, speak eloquently the language of life; missionaries who belong to no particular sect but who carry out under government supervision a gospel of social, economic and moral rehabilitation. No conflict here but the sweet anguish of hope. Men working the land with their hands to build a school for themselves and for their children, singing while they work.

There is fervor and apostolic zeal in the work. It is no accident that the rural teacher is so often called a missionary; in fact, the Department of Education alone has under its employ over one hundred and fifty men and women who are officially designated as "missionaries," and who are in fact carrying on a work of rehabilitation and civilization such as the missionary friars started at the beginning of the rule of Spain in Mexico, and which unfortunately came to an end after a period of a too short fifty years.

A soul was born to us, creating beauty out of despair. The Revolution clarified our aim and gave us a mind, and now, over the land, thousands of men are at work making the new Mexico.

Out of contrast and conflict are coming understanding and har-

mony. Just a faint beginning, fraught yet with danger, but determined and sure. A will to be, a sense of destiny. A belief that in the concert of peoples the Mexico we are now making has a part to play, that the Spirit of Light will yet speak through our race.

II

THE INDIAN HERITAGE

RAMÓN BETETA, lawyer and sociologist; born in Mexico City, a graduate of the University of Texas, was professor of sociology in the National University of Mexico; is now associated with the Beneficencia Pública, the department administering the charities and hospitals of the Federal District of Mexico.

SOCIAL FORCES IN MEXICAN LIFE

RAMÓN BETETA

IN THIS time of transportation by airplane, it ought not to be difficult to give a bird's-eye view of anything, but when the thing to be described is Mexico, the task becomes a difficult one. Perhaps it is difficult because I do not know very well what Mexico is. Nevertheless, the bird's-eye view that I am supposed to give you of "The Moving Forces in Mexican Life" includes about everything there is in my country.

Some one has called Mexico the land of contrast. At least it is the country of differences: physical differences as well as social differences and this again makes any description difficult. The peculiar characteristic of my country is that no one part of it and no one person living in it seems to be like any other part or any other person. That is not true of the United States in general. You are rather a homogeneous people with attitudes and minds and ways of living more or less alike. When I am about to meet an American, I know more or less what sort of person he is likely to be: I have some idea about his religion, his education and government, his conception of a God—and perhaps even of his opinion concerning evolution; I am able to guess with a fair amount of accuracy what color his eyes will be and the way he will be dressed. But when you are about to meet a Mexican, you will almost never know what sort of a person he will be. He may be dressed in English style or he may be dressed in a

pajama-like costume; he may speak Spanish or Aztec or one of a number of other languages. He may be dark-skinned or he may be white. He may have the same idea of a God that you have or he may have an entirely pagan idea of God. That is why I say that Mexico is a country yet to be born. It is a land that finds itself now in the process of formation, a land that we hope will soon be a nation.

Everything in Mexico seems to be moving, and not only moving but filled with conflicting currents, each fighting the other. When one describes any force in Mexico, one must perforce describe as well the element opposing it if one is to understand what is happening.

The first living force in Mexico is, in my opinion, the Indian. According to some writers, Mexico is an Indian nation. Such a conception is only partially true. Mexico is a land with an Indian aspect and it is very important that this Indian aspect be understood. At the same time, there is a white side of Mexico and it, too, is important and must not be overlooked.

The Indian side of Mexico is all too apparent. It is the first thing you see when you cross the border. The food, the clothing, the housing, even the medicines commonly used in Mexico, are in many respects Indian. Statistically speaking, the Indian has always been and still is important. In the year 1805 (before we had secured our Independence from Spain and when officially Mexico was still known as New Spain), there were in Mexico one million whites, 18% of the population; two million *mestizos* (mixed Indian and white blood), 38% of the population; and two and a half million Indians, 44% of the population. A century later, Mexico had one million one hundred and fifty thousand whites, 7½% of the population; eight million *mestizos*, 53% of the population and six million Indians, 39% of the population.

The influence of the Indian in Mexico is great in everything. Not only have the Indians existed, they have married with the whites. If I were asked what was the main difference between the history of the United States and the history of Mexico, I would say that it is the fact that the English colonists did not marry the Indians. They killed them instead. The Spaniards, on the other hand, were so unscrupulous as to intermarry with the Indians! That very fact is central in understanding anything that has happened or may happen in

Mexico. We are biologically and socially the product of the union of two races, of two civilizations that were, and still are, wide apart. And a great effort is now in process aiming to bring about a union and an amalgamation of the two that will be Mexico.

The Indian in us is to be found everywhere, not only in the dark eyes of our girls, but in our churches as well. These, the most Spanish of all things Spanish, were built by Indian hands, Indians who perhaps did not understand the God to whom the church was built but who just the same put the best of their artistic feeling into the task. That is why one often finds in our churches a certain pagan aspect which makes one suspect that the Indian did not exactly comprehend the new creed, but rather had adopted the exterior forms of a religion quite as he had adopted the Spanish language which expressed it, in reality keeping the old Indian spirit and ideas. This same result may be seen in our music and painting, in fact, in all that is Mexican.

In our attitude toward life, the Indian in us is also present. To the American business man who gets up early in the morning, who does not wake up his wife, but snatches a bite of breakfast and runs to the subway, hurries to the office and works all morning, has a glass of milk at noon, works all afternoon, takes the subway home, has dinner and then goes to bed, the Indian attitude must be unthinkable. The Indian is so perfectly satisfied. He is a person who really enjoys living, even if he be dirty, even if he be hungry, even if he be naked. It has taken many of us a long time to understand this attitude and we have the advantage of living in Mexico.

There are two fundamental ways in which to take life: one, the occidental attitude, exemplified by the American business man; the other, the oriental attitude, held by the Indian. The ideal of life is to be happy and, although there is no way to succeed, there are two ways to try to attain happiness: one, by having more and more needs each day, the other, by being satisfied with things as they are. The former is well-known in the United States. One finds instances of it in Mexico too, for Mexico seems to be trying to work out a synthesis of these two attitudes.

If "civilization" means the having of things, then the Indian is out of luck. But when one becomes disgusted with production for production's sake; when one realizes that producing a Ford every few

seconds has not saved the world; when one remembers that a crisis comes to our "civilized world" every few years; when one realizes that at the present time in the United States there are thousands, perhaps several millions, of men without work, men who want to work, who have the ability to work but who cannot find any work to do, and when one realizes that this is true in the face of so-called over-production, then one begins to feel that the qualities the Indian contributes are worth while after all. The Indians have given us a unique attitude toward life, an attitude which sometimes annoys you of the United States and even at times us Mexicans of white blood, but it is an attitude which also leads to much that is success in the real sense of the word, and of which art is but one expression.

The Indian has also given us his endurance, his physical and moral endurance. When you will visit the villages around Actopan, in the state of Hidalgo, where the Federal Department of Education has one of its "cultural missions," you will look about you and you will see nothing but *maguay* plants. You will be told that you are in an Indian village, but you will see no houses. Then you will begin to notice the people coming out of the holes where they live, and you will wonder how it is possible for people to exist in that dry land without water, without fertility, hostile to human life, without machinery, with none of the tools of civilization. Some of them, you are told, have been walking since before dawn to have the pleasure of seeing you, although their faces, their attitudes, their words tell nothing of their pleasure, for their pleasure is within them. But you must realize that it has taken great endurance to have persisted in that part of the world, against the great odds of nature and against us, the white part of the population in Mexico.

The Indians in Mexico exploited one another before the Spaniards came; they suffered three hundred years of exploitation by the Spaniards and then another hundred years by the Mexican leaders. One marvels that they have not disappeared. Our methods, it seems, were not so efficient as those you applied to the Indians in your country.

Physical endurance goes hand in hand with the mental endurance of the Indian. An Indian will walk all day long to come to a village where he will sell a *peso's* worth of merchandise; he will walk all night long to return home; an Indian may also suffer acute pain with-

out even so much as twitching the muscles of his face. We have ever so many examples of this in our history.

Then there is the "white" part of Mexico. The "white" part of Mexico will be easier for you to understand for it is closer to you. It has the same ideas, the same attitudes, the same purposes as you have. It has been contaminated with, and is sick of, industrialism, just as you are. You speak the same "language," even though you may not know Spanish and "white" Mexico does not speak English.

What of other social forces in Mexico? Certainly, the Revolution is the first of them. As Dr. Moisés Sáenz put it a year ago when speaking to you, "We in Mexico make a distinction between the Revolution with a capital and the revolutions with a small letter." The Revolution with a capital is the strongest force in Mexico. There are people who believe that we have had many revolutions, but we claim that we have had only one. True enough, it began in 1808, but it is still going on and we hope it will keep on going. This is not such a bloodthirsty proposition as it may sound, for there are two sides to the Revolution, the destructive and the constructive. I love them both equally, for one could not exist without the other.

Other speakers will deal with the Revolution so I shall not take your time explaining it. I do feel, however, that I should tell you why we have had this Revolution.

Let us consider why at the present time a revolution is quite impossible in the United States. It is not because the economic conditions of the country are perfect, not because everybody is satisfied, nor is it because you in the United States are a peace-loving people and we in Mexico are like fighting cocks or trained bulldogs. These things are not true. I have been in a revolution and I have felt, with those who have been in it, that fear of death, that reluctance to inflict death. Why then do we fight?

When men go out to kill each other, there is always a reason for it. One need not go into the details of the Spanish Colonial system or into the matter of the exploitation of the Indian and lower classes to be convinced that the majority of the population of Mexico has been persecuted and kept in misery; that they have been almost unbelievably exploited. In order to realize this fully, one needs only to visit a *hacienda*, or to consider the standard of living of the masses of Mex-

ico's population, or to recall the story of that Indian I have mentioned who walked all day to sell fifty cents worth of merchandise. You must put yourself in the place of the underdog and see if you would not have been willing to kill under the same conditions. When one is well-fed and satisfied, it is hard to realize the point of view of those "who do wrong," as we say; but when one feels the misery of millions of men, men who have been exploited for years upon end, for generation after generation; exploited economically, spiritually, morally, exploited in everything that is sacred to human beings, one realizes that it is natural for them to rise up with the desire to kill the men who have selfishly oppressed them. True, their situation after the killing is not always better than before. Often they have gone to the other extreme and matters have become worse. But, sooner or later, improvement will come, as the natural result of the Revolution. When that day arrives, when the ideal is realized, armed uprisings will cease. The Revolution will have killed itself. Thus, curiously enough, the Revolution has within itself the seeds of its own destruction. We know that it is owing to the Revolution that in some future day we will have no more revolutions. This, however, will not come to pass until the majority of the people in Mexico are able to live like human beings.

The Revolution, then, is the most important living force in Mexico. It has been in operation for many years, and it will still go on for a long time. Consequently, one must keep it in mind as one describes the land problem, or justifies the labor unions, or explains the separation of the Church and State, or talks about nationalizing the natural resources of the country. For the Revolution is a fundamental force in Mexico; it exists in the core of the country, in the hearts of the people. It is to be found in our paintings, in our songs, in our churches, in our poetry. When the Revolution seems to fail, when one of its leaders becomes an exploiter himself, or when the big movement degenerates into banditry, we do not become discouraged, for we believe in the Revolution; we have faith in the essential force of our social life.

I have said that the Revolution kills itself. This needs an explanation, and the best way to explain it is by an example. The International Workers of the World make it impossible for their leaders to hold property. Experience has taught them that radicalism and

property go ill together. As soon as a man in Mexico acquires a little land or has a decent salary, or ascends to a higher position in society, he ceases to desire far-reaching changes. With each new phase of the Revolution, we come nearer to the end of it, because only in a more equitable distribution of wealth, only in a more just system of government, in a larger control of foreign companies, is there a possibility of permanent, institutional peace in Mexico. In fact, I should hate to see any order established on a different basis, for I know that such an order would not last and that it would but make the next revolutionary outburst all the more painful.

Not everything, however, in the Revolution is destructive; it has its constructive side as well—albeit a side which could not have existed had it not been for the destructive aspect. The constructive purposes are two: first, to attain to the ideals of the Revolution; and second, to destroy the causes of its existence. In other words, thanks to the Revolution, we have “discovered” Mexico and have come to realize that our political uprisings are not spasmodic, misdirected movements without explanation or cause, but rather symptoms of an existent social maladjustment which must be corrected if peace is to be established. Therefore, the constructive forces of the Revolution are endeavoring to bring about such reforms as will give our people a chance to better their condition, an opportunity for self-expression and leadership other than through the medium of violent, destructive revolt. They attempt to create a political, economic and social system in which revolutions are unnecessary. This constructive side of our great historical movement is well exemplified in our present educational program.

Later on in this Seminar, other speakers will tell you about education in Mexico. I will not go into the details of this program here, but I do want to call your attention to a few fundamental facts. By education, we do not mean book instruction. We think it foolish to teach people how to write when they are not going to have paper to write on, or any one to write to, just as it is useless to teach them how to read and then never give them a book, or a magazine or even a newspaper. Reading and writing are, after all, but means of expression and they are not always the best suited to our people. Singing, dancing and art in general are sometimes better ways of expressing one's personality. By education we mean economic, moral and social education.

We mean to give, by means of education, what the Revolution offers to our lower classes in a quicker, yet more dangerous way. We know, for instance, that a peon who joins a revolutionary army goes to it half-naked, semi-starved, barefooted, owning nothing in the world, for he cannot even call a family his own. When he joins the army, he is given a horse that is his, a gun that is his, a hat, ammunitions and shoes that are also his own. Those are his first possessions; he is ready to fight for them. Eventually he goes to a city and eats, and perhaps he gets drunk. In due time he may drive a car and own a home, and, perhaps he may become a Minister in the Cabinet or even a President of the Republic. Those who have died in the struggle are forgotten; those who achieve success are visible. What a great stimulus for future revolts! But if an economic education would give that peon a possibility of self-improvement, of ascending to a higher level in society, of having power and a place in the world, the revolutions would be discouraged. A farmer who owns a piece of land, some cattle, a tractor and a coming crop will not listen to revolutions. He is conservative because he has something to lose, and he does not take unnecessary chances.

We hope then by means of education to make farmers of this type out of our peons, knowing that if education fails, they will become farmers through the medium of revolutions. This, perhaps, will give you a glance at the agrarian problem in Mexico, a problem intimately connected with education. It is not surprising, then, that in our rural schools, quite as much as we teach the three "Rs," we teach methods of cultivation of the soil, hygienic habits, the care of pigs, cows, rabbits, bees, chickens; we teach a coöperative system of marketing and we place greater faith in singing, dancing, playing and acting than we do in reading and writing.

With this aim in view, we have multiplied the number of schools and greatly increased the amount of money spent on them. Some figures will show you the increase; during Colonial times, among one and a half million children of school age, only sixty thousand actually attended the schools. In the years following Independence, education did not improve. It was not until 1865, immediately following that phase of our Revolution known as *La Reforma*, that rural education under government control was established in Mexico. From that time

until 1878, there was an increase in the number of schools. They reached the four thousand mark. However, at the end of the Diaz régime, after more than thirty years of peace and so-called material progress, only three out of every ten children of school age went to school.

The days following the fall of Diaz were filled with destruction and the number of schools did not increase. Yet at the present time, we have over fifteen thousand schools on which the Federal Government alone spends over twenty-three million pesos a year. This makes it possible for more than fifty per cent of the children of school age to attend school. I do not mean to give you the impression that we have reached our goal; I do not overlook the fact that fully half of the children of Mexico do not go to school because they have no school to go to; but I do pretend to show you the greater emphasis which has been given to education in the last few years.

We have attempted, as you have seen, to increase the number of schools and while this increase in mere numbers interests us greatly, of far greater significance to us is what we call the "orientation" of the methods of education in these schools. If you go to our rural schools you will find that the teacher is not solely a person who gives out knowledge. She is the center of the town. She is the one who knows about health, who tells the people what to eat, who cares for the mothers when their babies are born and gives them advice on their feeding and care, who works in the schoolroom with the children by day and with the adults by night, who shows them how to improve the land and work it to better advantage, and how to care for domestic animals. In every rural school you will find nearby a small orchard, a patch of land, also cultivated by the pupils, a beehive, a pigsty and a chicken-pen and all of these things are considered by us of far greater importance in the education of the people than mere books.

With the enormous increase in the number of schools, we were confronted with the problem of training our rural teachers. In the beginning, we simply improvised them, using any young man or woman who had the desire to work and the right attitude. Later on the rural normal schools were founded for the special purpose of training rural teachers. Besides, in order to improve the technique and to be certain of unity in action, the Rural Missions were created.

Rural Missions are groups of men and women with special training in the different fields—a teacher, a social worker who is also a nurse, a teacher of popular arts, a musician, an agronomist, a physical director and an expert in small industries. These *missiones* hold institutes in strategical places throughout the country where the rural teachers of the region meet. There the local school is taken as a model and for a few weeks the mission works with the teachers, with the children and with the community. Their work is imitated by the rural teachers when they go back to their villages and thus the new ideas in rural education grow like a snow-ball throughout the Republic. In addition, some permanent *missiones* have been founded in those places in which they seem most necessary. The excellent results of these institutions can already be felt. Education then, as it is peculiarly understood and as it is being carried out in Mexico, is one of the greatest forces in the life of the country.

Then there is the agrarian force, the driving force of our rural classes who had been land hungry for centuries. Other speakers will tell you how few were the people who owned land in Mexico before the Revolution, of how wasteful the system of production was, and of the injustices of the social and political régime of the country. They will tell you also about the *latifundio* system and about the peonage; they will mention to you, I am certain, the various attempts made throughout the history of Mexico to get the land back to the people and about the failure of those attempts. But for the present it will be sufficient to say that one of the driving forces in Mexico is the desire of our people to have land, and, having land, to free themselves from economic and political servitude.

You will listen also to lecturers who are going to tell you of the many difficult problems in connection with the agrarian situation: the need to finance the people and to give them a technique which will enable them to work the land after they have secured it; the necessity to arouse in them a desire to till the soil; the urgent need to teach them better methods of cultivation and the use of modern machinery. But no matter how difficult a problem the land question may be, no matter how complex, how involved, the agrarian movement must go on with its distribution of land, with the establishment of agrarian banks and with the creation of agricultural coöperatives and agricul-

tural schools. The methods of solution may change, it is true: radicalism might possibly be substituted by a more peaceful policy; land might be paid for in cash instead of bonds; a scientific attitude might, perhaps, take the place of the existing methods of political expediency. But should the movement be stopped we shall never have peace in Mexico, for we should fail irremediably in the other aspects of the Revolution. And no matter how the process may be, we must always keep in mind that it is people and their happiness and not the production of wealth that matters.

Another force in Mexican life is organized labor. The laborers in Mexico have acquired a class consciousness which has made it possible for them to unite and struggle in an effort to better their condition. Thanks to their unions, our workmen have finally understood their rights and are acquiring a sense of responsibility and a knowledge of their duties; but above all, they have succeeded in raising their standard of living. There are in Mexico, to be sure, strikes and lock-outs. Sometimes the fighting is not necessarily fair, but as a whole, the unions have helped not only the workmen themselves, but also the production of wealth and society at large. Besides, our laboring class has become a political factor in Mexico. This, of course, as the history of other countries shows, may prove to be rather more dangerous than promising for the future of the labor movement.

You have no doubt heard a good deal about the so-called religious question in Mexico, a question which I dare say is not religious but political. Yet, call it as you may, this unrest caused by religious or by pseudo-religious motives has been an important factor in the history of my country and should perhaps be accorded some explanation at this time. Very early in the history of the Revolution in Mexico, that is, at the time of the War of Independence, the church as an institution began resisting the revolutionary movement. The church excommunicated Hidalgo and was responsible for the execution of Morelos. Throughout later years, the church, as an institution of landowners and of conservative minds, has symbolized in Mexico everything the Revolution has been fighting. The liberal movement known as *La Reforma*, was directed mainly against the church as a landowner, rather than against any system of beliefs or any dogma or ceremonial. Unfortunately, our reformers missed the point, and

although they took the land away from the Catholic Church they did not solve the agrarian problem.

Yet if this struggle between the Catholic Church and the Liberal and Revolutionary Governments is not a religious question, we do have a problem in Mexico in connection with religion; it is the problem of establishing a common belief among our people.

I have just heard Mr. Herring say that many of you represent the different churches of your country, and yet I believe that this group before me undoubtedly possesses some fundamental unity in religion. Such a group could scarcely be found in Mexico, if it was to be representative of our people, for every one of us understands religion in a different way, and the difference is not one of mere details but of essentials. Millions of the people in Mexico could not be called Christians in the exact sense of the word, for they still believe in their ancient gods. The names have changed, but the beliefs remain, as true to their past as the ceremonies expressing them. Many of the religious celebrations you will see in our smaller villages have unquestionably a pagan flavor, though they may have a Catholic name.

The unity of sentiment of the Mexican people as expressed in their art, and which seems to have been born since the Colonial times, has not been attained in religion. True enough, many of the Catholic saints now have Indian names added to the original Spanish ones, but this nominal synthesis does not represent a synthesis of feeling, for we have not, as yet, a religion we may call Mexican. And Mexico needs to have one religion, whether it is Christian or not, and if Christian, whether Protestant or Catholic. The need for one religion is almost as urgent as the need for one language. It would help us in arriving at the spiritual union which will be Mexico.

I have attempted to give you a bird's-eye view of the moving forces of Mexico. Now I may ask: Out of all this, what? What is it that we revolutionists of Mexico are hoping for? What is there in the future for us to do? Are these social forces in Mexico like those blind forces of nature, having no purpose, no goal, no aim? Are they like the torrential force of an over-flooded river which would destroy everything in its path with no apparent motive? I do not think so. I see in all these forces I have described a common end, the nation of Mexico. We do not expect that this will come tomorrow, but no matter how

far in the future it may lie, the goal exists and all the forces are working in that general direction.

With the Revolution, our greatest force, we have discovered ourselves; analyzing the Revolution, we have understood our heterogeneity, our lack of unity; studying its causes, we have found at the base of our society a system of injustice and oppression; investigating its results, we have found a movement of integration, a desire for mutual understanding and a realization of better economic conditions for our lower classes. All the various sides of the Revolution point toward the same goal: the agrarian movement, which has come to the point of constructiveness; the labor movement which has already united more than a million men; the nationalization of the natural resources which is helping the Mexicans to develop Mexico; our oil and mineral laws which prevent the wasteful exploitation of our subsoil with no profit to the country itself; the paintings covering the walls of our public buildings which already represent the true types of Mexico—our Indians and our *mestizos* and our few whites, the scenes of our revolutions with their sorrow and their hope, with their cruelty and their enlightenment; our songs which while neither Indian nor white already express the sentiment and the aspirations of the newly born Mexican soul. In all of these, as well as in many other phases of the Revolution, we perceive the attainment of our great hope: that Mexico may become a real nation.

July, 1930.

MORRIS TOPCHEVSKY, a Hull House boy, first student and later instructor in the Hull House art classes, was drawn to Mexico in 1925 by Diego Rivera's murals. He has returned each year to study Mexican life and to paint the Mexican scene.

THE INDIAN AS I KNOW HIM

MORRIS TOPCHEVSKY

THERE are two ways of knowing the Indian. One way is to select an individual and study him; another is to take the Indian from north to south, from east to west, of Mexico, and form a composite person. This will more nearly give the real Indian because from north to south, from east to west, there have been conditions which have influenced the Indian type. One must take part of each individual that comes into his experience in order to find the true Indian.

I have seen the Indians in Oaxaca living in the most picturesque manner. Oaxaca is a country which, when looked upon from a hill, seems like an ocean with crystallized waves. One sees the Indians running single file in a certain rhythm from village to village with packs on their backs, selling little things they have made, making twenty-five cents here, gaining fifty cents there, and after about ten days of walking from market-town to market-town and market-day to market-day, come home with perhaps five pesos, five pesos for goods that have taken them perhaps a month to make. Indeed, the Indian shows remarkable endurance.

I have seen the Indians in these villages sitting by a fire, discussing the philosophies and mysteries of the world. They ask me, "Can you explain this mystery?" But I cannot. At least they have mastered their situation. I have not.

We know of the brutalities of the revolution and the campaigns.

The Indians do not give in even though they know it will be a long struggle. Often the women go with their men to make the tortillas behind the box-cars and to load the guns. The will to live is strong in them.

I do not need to tell you about the Indian as an artist. You yourselves have seen him as such. The articles made by his hand are in every market. The surety of his skill as an artist is amazing. There is no hesitation. He knows what he wants and his touch is sure. The Indians spoke in the language of the artist centuries ago. And in this way they still speak. It is only recently that the world is recognizing their language.

PABLO GONZALEZ CASANOVA, author and educator; distinguished philologist and ethnologist; contributor to "Mexican Folkways."

THE INDIAN HERITAGE

PABLO GONZALES CASANOVA

THE noble men who came first to this New Spain as missionaries of Christianity did not realize the difficulty of translating their language into the Indian vernacular. And due to this oversight the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were rich in works whose purpose was to teach in the Indian's language in order to inculcate in his mind the theological and moral teachings of Christianity. Perhaps without its being noticed, the missionaries diminished the spiritual harvest that they wished to reap by translating into the Indian language the words which in their tongue expressed the highest concepts of the doctrine they preached. For when these words were translated into the ver-

MORRIS TOPCHEVSKY, a Hull House boy, first student and later instructor in the Hull House art classes, was drawn to Mexico in 1925 by Diego Rivera's murals. He has returned each year to study Mexican life and to paint the Mexican scene.

THE INDIAN AS I KNOW HIM

MORRIS TOPCHEVSKY

THERE are two ways of knowing the Indian. One way is to select an individual and study him; another is to take the Indian from north to south, from east to west, of Mexico, and form a composite person. This will more nearly give the real Indian because from north to south, from east to west, there have been conditions which have influenced the Indian type. One must take part of each individual that comes into his experience in order to find the true Indian.

I have seen the Indians in Oaxaca living in the most picturesque manner. Oaxaca is a country which, when looked upon from a hill, seems like an ocean with crystallized waves. One sees the Indians running single file in a certain rhythm from village to village with packs on their backs, selling little things they have made, making twenty-five cents here, gaining fifty cents there, and after about ten days of walking from market-town to market-town and market-day to market-day, come home with perhaps five pesos, five pesos for goods that have taken them perhaps a month to make. Indeed, the Indian shows remarkable endurance.

I have seen the Indians in these villages sitting by a fire, discussing the philosophies and mysteries of the world. They ask me, "Can you explain this mystery?" But I cannot. At least they have mastered their situation. I have not.

We know of the brutalities of the revolution and the campaigns.

The Indians do not give in even though they know it will be a long struggle. Often the women go with their men to make the tortillas behind the box-cars and to load the guns. The will to live is strong in them.

I do not need to tell you about the Indian as an artist. You yourselves have seen him as such. The articles made by his hand are in every market. The surety of his skill as an artist is amazing. There is no hesitation. He knows what he wants and his touch is sure. The Indians spoke in the language of the artist centuries ago. And in this way they still speak. It is only recently that the world is recognizing their language.

PABLO GONZALEZ CASANOVA, author and educator; distinguished philologist and ethnologist; contributor to "Mexican Folkways."

THE INDIAN HERITAGE

PABLO GONZALES CASANOVA

THE noble men who came first to this New Spain as missionaries of Christianity did not realize the difficulty of translating their language into the Indian vernacular. And due to this oversight the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were rich in works whose purpose was to teach in the Indian's language in order to inculcate in his mind the theological and moral teachings of Christianity. Perhaps without its being noticed, the missionaries diminished the spiritual harvest that they wished to reap by translating into the Indian language the words which in their tongue expressed the highest concepts of the doctrine they preached. For when these words were translated into the ver-

nacular they differed from the original idea, or changed it to the detriment of the moral impression which they hoped to make upon the mind of the aboriginal population. The diversity of Indian languages and their number constituted the first barrier—although not the principal one—that was to oppose the zeal of these men.

One of the daring priests, Friar Jerome de Mendieta, tells in the interesting pages of his *Indian Ecclesiastical History* of the anxieties and dangers which his contemporaries and coreligionists underwent in order to acquire the knowledge of the Indian's language.

To the eyes of those enterprising men the difference of language seemed to be the greatest obstacle, perhaps the only one. They counted on the docility of the Indian, for he had given proofs of a reverence which was so great that he did not even dare to address them. It was not until later that they realized that this apparent docility was more discouraging for their catechizing work than rebellion itself. They discovered then that it was only meekness of spirit . . . or Indian courtesy! Even today the Indian who respects the tradition of his ancestors never dares to contradict his superior. And a foreigner who was also a priest was for the Indian doubly superior.

Facing the serious problem of learning a language without a teacher, the good missionaries resorted to prayer, and in that century of faith their prayer was heard. "The Lord put in their hearts," writes Mendieta, "the will to make themselves children again with their little pupils in order to participate in their language and with the language bring about the conversion of the people, childish in their unsophistication and simplicity of manner." A very noble work was theirs, and mostly a fruitful one for the knowledge of the languages of the Indians; but fruitful only in appearance for the work of faith.

Soon the missionaries were familiar with the Indian languages and in the sixteenth century a number of them gained a just fame for their writings in these languages. Their writings were either of a didactic or catechistic character. In fact, there were so many of the works written in that century and the two which followed that their simple enumeration and cataloguing would take several volumes. But, as a recompense to their efforts and their fervor, they soon arrived at the certainty, sad for them, that the conversion of the Indian was only an apparent one. "The fervent missionaries," writes a distinguished

historian, "who, like Friar Toribio de Bonavente, had boasted about converting hundreds of Indians, began to face the hard reality which proved the apparent conversion of the multitudes; they had received the baptismal waters as if they were passing showers, which only dampened the surface of the earth, without stimulating the planted grain, nor making it bear fruit."

Then the attitude of both the missionary and the Indian changed. The missionary tried to obtain with an iron hand that which he had not obtained by persuasion. The Indian, without perhaps understanding that change of attitude, openly declared himself in rebellion or escaped the oppression of the missionary with slyness and deceit.

Then began the era of martyrs, whose numbers soon grew to be almost as large as that of the missionaries who wrote in the Indian languages. The cult of the Indian gods was strengthened, although in complete secrecy; due to the strong hand of the Inquisition the cult of the disappearing gods finally disappeared with their priests. But, mixed in a strange union with Christian beliefs, they left behind them many of the foremost practices and old beliefs. These were hidden in mystery or adapted to the new ritual, putting the saints in the place of the fallen idols.

Friar Bernardino de Sahagún, the illustrious Indian historian, was one of the first to speak about the seriousness of the situation and about the error committed in adapting the old pagan sanctuaries to the practices of the Catholic church and also in conniving at the idolatrous practices which lived on after being adapted to Christian rites and formulas. Many others following Friar Bernardino de Sahagún, clergymen and laymen, tried to make themselves heard, urging the extirpation from the triumphant religion of the superstitious beliefs and practices which, under the cover of Christianity, persisted among the Indians.

Don Pedro de Ponce, in his *Brief Story of the Gods and Rites of the Gentility*, Dr. Pedro Sanchez de Aguilar in his *Report Against Idolorum Cultores of the Episcopate of Yucatán*, the famous Hernando Ruiz de Alarcón, in his well documented *Treatise on the Superstitions of the Natives of This New Spain*, and many others, referred in their books to the whole kingdom, or in particular to certain provinces—

Chiapas, Oaxaca, etc. But all of them denounced what they regarded as the evil which was corrupting the Christianity of the new converts.

This went on for centuries! But the voices of these men were lost in the desert.

It will be most interesting to go over the pages which Friar Bernardino de Sahagún gives in his history to the story of the superstitions of the Indians of Mexico in the sixteenth century, and to compare them with those of the Indian and half-breed (even occasional ones of the white man) of four centuries later, in the Mexico of the twentieth century. I must content myself with enumerating, although very briefly, some of the most prevalent superstitions. Although many are common, or have a similarity to the popular religious life of old Europe, they are nevertheless a heavy ballast for that more elevated form of religious thought which we call Christianity, and sometimes deform it to such a degree that it often merges with idolatry.

I shall only speak of the most common superstitions which concern human life—those of birth, of love, and of death.

The woman who expects to be a mother must be careful to hide herself from an eclipse, for fear the child may be born with a lip or other parts of its body eaten up by the moon. If during her pregnancy she is deprived of having any of her wishes, of eating whatever she craves, the child will be born with some stain on his skin.

In order that she may come out well from her danger, she must be taken to the church so that the priest may give her St. Charles' Benediction, or she must pray to Santa Marina del Mar, whose image must hang above her bed.

If the birth is difficult, the image of St. Anthony is placed in a corner, standing on its head. St. Anthony will get sweethearts for girls, remedy poverty, and find lost things, if he is given as a thank offering when he has answered the prayer, thirteen pieces of bread or thirteen coins, or any other offering numbering thirteen.

In some regions they are content to cover the saint's head with a black cloth during the birth of the child, and they uncover it when all has gone as they wished, thanks also to the tallow candle, lit in honor of Santa Maria de Monserrato and to Santa Marta, whose image they turn against the wall, and to whom they pray three *Pater-nosters*.

Once the baby is born the umbilical cord is cut. Some burn it, in order that the child may not have eye trouble; others bury it, preferably near the hearth—the *tlecuilli* of the Indian's house—so that the child may be docile and diligent when it grows up. The Otomies have the custom of putting the cords to dry, with great care, in order to take them one day and hang them from a tree consecrated to that purpose in the popular Sanctuary of the Christ of Chalma, one of the most frequently visited sanctuaries, year after year, a short distance from Mexico City. In the same manner as in most of Europe, especially Italy, in order to save the child from some ominous influence, a little coral necklace is hung from its neck, or a little jet band.

A truly Indian custom is that of hanging around the child's neck, besides the corals, some red seeds spotted with black, which have the shape of beans and are called in Mexican *pipiltzin*, as well as the seeds called *cabalonga* and deer's-eyes, which are cheerfully worn together with the cross, some medals and a little bunch of aromatic herbs.

If, in spite of all these precautions, the child is the victim of the disease called in Spanish, "evil eye," it is "cleaned," that is, the hand wrapped up in the father's trousers is passed over the body; the napkin which is used as a sieve for the *atole* is tied to his neck, and then passes are made over it with a leaf of a tree called "sleepy sapota," and lastly, an egg is broken into a plate full of water. In the heart of the yolk can then be seen the "eye" which was hurting the child.

When the Indians enter puberty, love begins to play its rôle in their lives. A dried humming bird or little pieces of bone from some human skeleton play the rôle of amulets to conquer the disdainful woman, who could neither resist the efficacy of this nor of the Sainted Mag-nate Stone Prayer. This is sold in popular editions in the markets, illustrated with the image of the cross and the instruments of the Passion. Along with it goes a little piece of the stone, to which is attributed the virtue of gaining every one's will for its devotee if he carries it piously with him.

As for the saints, their rôle in affairs of love is not insignificant. As in Spain, Saint Anthony enjoys fame as an aid in love, in particular for those maidens who desire to get married. In order to obtain this

aid, besides praying thirteen *Pater-nosters* during thirteen Tuesdays, his picture or image is stuck head first into a well or cupboard.

At his side figures Saint Ciro, of whom it is told that he always contradicts his devotees; in order to obtain help from him to get a sweetheart, the maiden begs him not ever to let her marry, and she says a prayer to him every day; this prayer need not be a special one, but must be dedicated to him and said backwards.

If the wife wishes to separate her husband from some rival, relatives or men friends who in her judgment are taking her husband from her, she commends herself to San Judas Tadeo, praying a *novena* with special prayers for the purpose. According to the populace these prayers are so efficacious that the saint never fails to hear them, and he often sends death to the person whom the wife is trying to drive away.

When the husband allows himself to be influenced by bad friends and the wife does not know how to appeal to San Judas Tadeo or does not wish to do so, she measures her husband when asleep from head to foot with a cord or tape which is then taken to a church to be put into the hand of Saint Benito. The saint must then be prayed to in the following manner: The Credo must be said three times each Saturday for nine consecutive Saturdays.

After love (omitting the curing of diseases through superstitious practices mixed with popular medical traditions) death, the last stage of human life, is no less interesting for our purpose.

Purgatory or hell of the Catholic tradition has a likeness in the place called at the present time *mictlancalco*—the place of death in contemporary Mexican folklore. It is said that the devil guides there all those who died in accidents and that it is located towards the east. On this point it is well to remember that the missionaries took from the Indian tradition the name *mictlan* to translate that of hell, although the idea is different.

Others who die of natural death, of old age or disease, are said to suffer during eight days, flying around their old habitation if they have left a duty undone or desire unfulfilled. On the day of death relatives bring as a gift to the dead one seeds and money, which the family devotes to the visitors who come to give their condolences. On

this occasion *tamales* are sometimes prepared, called in Mexican *mictlantamalli*—*tamales* of the place of death.

A great quantity of holy water is then used, sprinkling it in the corner of the house to drive away the dead one. The corpse, if it is a man, whether it is put in a coffin or wrapped in a straw mat, is provided with cigars, a big jar of *pulque*, a bag of *tamales* and *tortillas*; if it is a boy child he is provided with some toys, according to his age, food or mother's milk in a little jar, besides consecrated palms, the cross, medals, images and some other contribution of Christianity.

All Souls' day—the universal and ancient celebration—is observed among a great part of the people of Mexico, particularly among the Indians, with many pagan aspects.

In the best part of the house an altar is arranged upon which are placed the offerings destined for the dead, who are supposed to return that day to visit their people. The offerings consist of special *tamales* made with raw maize sweetened with sugar or stuffed with meat, one or more jars of *pulque*, a great quantity of *tortillas*, a glass of water, a little salt, some fruits, and an *ayate* or piece of Indian hemp cloth so that the dead may take everything away; however, the dead are usually content with the perfume of all these things and leave to the live persons the task of consuming the different foods and drinks; among the foods the so-called bread for the dead is frequently found.

At night the whole family gather before that altar and pray in unison, directed by the oldest member; each one brings a few red maize *tamales* and a wax candle weighing a pound.

My intention is not to determine in which cases the gods and the ritual practices, Christian in appearance, have only changed their names for that of saints and changed respectively the form of practice. My intention is only to emphasize the fact that in spite of the centuries of teaching, of the zeal and fervor of the noble apostles of Christianity, of the tenacity of the ancient Inquisition in persecuting and punishing the forms of idolatry, idolatry lives on immovably, like an ancient stratum, a pagan inheritance, survival of religions long since disappeared.

Side by side with Christianity which together with the Mosaic law is considered by the peoples of occidental civilization the highest form of religious experience; side by side with Christianity, I repeat, in its

most elevated form, we discover that the popular religion inspires itself into a magic concept at the service of a selfish well-being; that it puts itself into direct, familiar contact with alleged superior forces—whether they be fetiches, idols, gods or saints—praying to them in order to importune them and trying to propitiate them with offerings or to subdue them to its will (for its benefit) often with practices which Christianity deems sacrilegious.

What were the causes that obstructed the work of the missionaries and brought forth unpromising fruits? What are the causes that are even today a danger and which threaten to have no less fatal consequences in the future?

Frustrated in their hopes, recognizing the uselessness of their great efforts and sacrifices, even as early as in the eighteenth century, Don Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana y Buitron, an eminent writer and a virtuous man, Archbishop and later Cardinal of Mexico, interpreting the experience, pointed out to his coreligionists the great error which had been committed by deforming the language of the Indians and adulterating the religious concepts with an unlimited number of words made up by the priest in order to designate the Sacraments, Mysteries, the creed of Catholicism.

“And how are they to explain them in the Mexican, Otomi, Huasteco, Totonaco and other innumerable languages,” indignantly remarks the wise prelate, “when the work of the catechism is the most difficult one, where the most eminent persons have met difficulties and which is taken out of the quintessence, the substance of the Counsels or Sainted Fathers? How are Idolatries and Superstitions to be suppressed if perhaps the Vicar or Abbot do not understand the peculiar words with which the Indians maliciously explain themselves? Not even the ministers of language understand them. How can they explain their sins in confession if they seem to turn into logs, and as I have heard from zealous ministers of language, do not themselves know the kind of sin which they have committed?”

As can be seen, the wise prelate was not mistaken.

The good missionaries did not understand it so, and seeing their plans defeated, they began quickly to punish, either directly or through laymen, the persistence of the Indian in his beliefs. In the beginning of the eighteenth century one of the missionaries, echoing

the general feeling about the Indians, advised his coreligionists emphatically: "Speak to them imperiously. Deny them a seat, make them speak tonelessly and in a low voice. Make them tie their *manta* over their shoulders and not wear it loose. Do not allow them to take snuff or to smoke in your presence. Their monarch Moctezuma told Cortés that they were driven by evil . . . and experience shows it is the truth; for they only obey those who have the authority to give justice, and if they do something for some other person who does not have this authority, it is because of personal gain or the desire to steal; and so, there being no temporal remuneration for spiritual things, they do the latter in a lazy fashion and only when forced to it.

"Lastly," continues Fray Francisco de Avila, "when shown favor they are audacious; they are like children, deceived with sweets and scared with the whip. With a little fruit or chicken they deceive the brightest, so it is not well to receive their gift. They are not grateful for the good done to them; even though their priest may do all he can for them, they seek to do him ill; they fear only those who hurt them."

— It is sufficient with such paragraphs, selected from the preface of *The Art of the Mexican Language* by Fray Francisco de Avila of the lower order of the Franciscans, to see the immense difference between this method of judging the Indians and that of Fray Bartolome de las Casas and the Beato Palafox y Mendoza, who wrote a book on *The Virtues of the Indian*.

Those who prize his humility, docility and piety, as well as those who accuse him of ingratitude, ill-doing, astuteness and ill-faith, are in grave error, even though such praises and accusations have been repeated during many centuries. The Indian is neither better nor worse than any other being of the human race. Neither is he more intelligent nor more stupid than any other individual of any other nation.

His mentality is surely primitive, to judge by different aspects of his social, moral and religious life, which show a magic and essentially collective concept of the world. If because of this he has not molded himself immediately to our western civilization, to our religious concepts, to our ethics, in a word, to us, the fault is mostly

ours and not his, for we have not sensed the basic difference between these cultures, and we have not found the way to win these primitive people to our conduct of life.

But let us leave this topic, for it would take too long to go farther into a matter which requires so much attention and space.

Let us speak concretely: What does the Indian want and hope to get from us? It is simply what we want and ask for: Understanding.

We have not understood the Indian because we have never participated in his life—mental, moral, material, social, or religious. Nor have we tried to understand it. What we have done up to now, what we do and will doubtless continue doing, is to go near him only to impose upon him our point of view, our moral, religious, social and economic concepts . . . in a word, to force him to accept our civilization. And of course we leave for him the worst part of it, the suffering, and we are very well satisfied to have him copy our outward being and repeat our words, even if he does not understand them.

We have never wanted to know what his hopes are, his ambition, his way of thinking. We have only tried to subject him to our hopes, our ambitions, to force him to think as we do.

If the first missionaries, because of their saintly fervor and noble zeal, deceived themselves into thinking that they could teach the Indians, without thought of personal gain, the principal arts and industries along with religion, the Indian believed them to have in mind personal gain, because they made him pray, and the industries which were taught him had immediate and direct application in the construction of the church and the priest's house, which arose from the very foundations with the suffering of the neophytes.

If faith is capable of moving mountains, fear is capable of moving a world. And the world of the Indian, uprooted from its traditional orbit, gave in to the fear of the supernatural, and entered into the orbit of a new world, that of the Cross and the Sword.

Since then the Indian, involuntary participant of our struggles, meekly allows himself to be led, but he drags with him all the ballast of the past; we do nothing to refine the rough stone, to draw from its crude texture the light of its spirit; we have been content to call the Indian stupid, to condemn him for his inability if he does not take

unto himself a language and a culture which he does not understand.

Without doubt we *can* win him to our side, and we shall try to do it and shall doubtless achieve it when, coming down from our pedestal of a privileged race, of superior peoples, we come near to the heart of the Indian, when we become convinced that he is human—divinely human—and initiate him little by little, patiently, as one would a child, without trying to get him on one side or another, without discord as to whom the triumph should belong, such as used to divide the missionaries and today divides the political parties; rather we must trust time and its action, and rest assured that that which is noble will be a reality tomorrow even if it is not today.

Once we have realized the true situation of the Indian with respect to us, we shall no longer struggle selfishly to make proselytes for this or that religious or political cause, forcing him to accept our truth; but we will unite our efforts for the welfare of that portion of humanity which, left behind because of special conditions of isolation from the other peoples, awaits, like Lazarus, a voice saying: "Arise and walk," to go itself in search of truth.

Instruction and education, those are the things we must first give the Indian. Then he will understand us and we shall understand him; his mentality will adapt itself to ours, his world to our world; his language will enrich itself because his thought has been enriched, and no matter which language it is, we shall be able to understand it and make ourselves understood.

But if we persist in disregarding his way of feeling and being, only trying to impose ours upon him; if we give ourselves up to selfish struggles for an ephemeral and false triumph; if instead of looking towards the future we only wish to see the present, the passing moment . . . then the Indian, taking refuge in the impregnable fortress of his ancient tradition, will contemplate us with astonishment, in the end indifferent; and instead of reasoning like Nathan the Wise—Lessing's character—when in our anxiety to know to whom the triumph belongs we ask the Indian where he thinks the truth is,—religious, moral, political truth . . . truth itself—he will answer with his meek, indifferent phrase, chiseled by centuries of slavery, "*Quien sabe?*"

RAFAEL HELIODORO VALLE, *journalist and writer on colonial art and literature. Author of "Como Era Iturbide," "La Nao de la China," "Primicias de la Civilizacion Mexicana," associate editor of "Excelsior," a daily newspaper in Mexico City.*

THE LEGENDS OF MEXICO

RAFAEL HELIODORO VALLE

A FUSION of two brilliant mentalities, Indian and Spanish, the legend in Mexico is a winged form of emotion. Here, where creed is ceremonial and not an expression of inner conduct, every Mexican harbors a passion that burns into song or melts in the flame of "the marvelous." Legend came perhaps from the Orient, with the first rays of the sun, when vessels brought messages of the last inhabitants of Atlantis. On reaching the plateau it was unable to shake off the colors of the sea, because the eagle on the cactus eating serpent's flesh; the humming bird moaning the ancient promise made by those who came from the "old red land" of the north; or Quetzalcoatl, the majestic personage—the serpent of all myths—wearing splendid emeralds since the dawn of the universe, were nothing but proofs that legend wished to build its own palace in a magic country of colors. Legend arrived in Mexico in flight and burst into song; it continues to sing today.

When corn first appeared, perhaps one thousand years before Christ, and when the rooster was tamed, old Anahuac had already been invaded by a delight in the incredible. Already, concern with human origin, and with the hereafter, filled life with anxiety. The Aztec calendar registers four deluges which occurred before man had been purified. According to Popol-Vuh, the sacred book of the Mayas, the gods on the mountain made three attempts in early times to make

man after their own images. The first man was made of cork, but he was a creature without desire and without tears; the second, of clay, was destroyed for clumsiness and ingratitude by a storm sent by the gods; and the third, of corn, of the four kinds of corn, meaning the four human races: white, yellow, red and black; for that reason the mythology explains men love the providential cereal, from which they come and for which they fight. This origin seems far more pleasant than that of man's being made out of earth and hay, as stated by Father Cogolludo, when interpreting the Maya Genesis he sought to find in America a counterpart of Eden. The history of the first seeds is linked closely with the appearance of weavers, jade-workers, students of stars or interpreters of dreams.

THE FIRST PRINCE OF LIGHT

But men had not been familiar with cotton, jewelry-making and astrology until Quetzalcoatl appeared, bringing his message. Before he came hatred, darkness, laziness and misery reigned supreme. He is the Good News coming from the Orient. He taught men to dress, and invited them to have peace and to dominate nature. For this alone he is one of the greatest heroes in history, despite his living in the charmed kingdom of fiction. When he went away, because people no longer understood him, after having lived in Anahuac approximately one long century of light, darkness returned; but he announced he would come back in the attire of a prince ready for a grand morning festival. He would return to his kingdom of clouds when blue-eyed, fair-headed men came over the sea in "movable cities."

When the codex was borne out by the appearance of Grijalva's caravels, there was an instant of happy expectation on the beach of Veracruz. The fulfillment of prophecy was imminent. There must have been the same commotion in the souls and scenery as upon the appearance of the first rainbow; and light appeared again, and men saw that the light was good. The strange ships brought iron, domestic animals, phonetic writing, the God who would demolish other deities, the Pater-noster and wheat bread—all of which legend did not mention, but previously had been announced by Quetzalcoatl.

THE FLESH OF MAIZE AND SOUL OF HEAVEN

The gods came on horseback, and men heard the words, "Love each other." They thought Cortés and his soldiers were immortal and had dropped from heaven, for they played with light and death. But the prophecy was about to fail when many Spaniards fell in battle and when a young king set out to fight the gods, to struggle against prophecy. It was Cuauhtemoc, beautiful beyond description, angrily throwing toward the stars the flying dart of Ilhuicamina. But the stars remained unmoved, whether for disdain or astonishment no one seems to know. And the great silence came again, until another blue-eyed man, Fray Pedro de Gante, taught children to read and sing. Quetzalcoatl was returning a peacemaker, a white soul coming to avenge the eclipse of light. And in the lakes of Anahuac there was silence, for the eagle was falling: Cuauhtemoc, a mortal being, flesh of maize and soul of heaven, needed three centuries to add his divine number to the Western Zodiac.

Quetzalcoatl and Cuauhtemoc are the two most luminous legends of Mexico, because both have about them the subtle essence of Life. Oblivion, that is to say, Death, is impotent against them. No mythology can boast of heroes that surpass them, for in Mexico, the country of colors, legend is originality and has the richness and elegance of an exquisite flower of the imagination.

What must have been the surprise of Cortés and Bernal Díaz--not to mention other conquerors--at their being considered gods, and how small they must have felt before the new things that were to be seen and pondered upon with such astonishment! The Indians looked upon these men as supernatural beings, even as we might look today on visitors from another planet, while the fact that the Spaniards had crossed the ocean, and their king also, lent them gigantic proportions. They were alive, they inhabited an incredible world, they were a living legend. It was necessary only to touch them, to awake them. Even now we must repeat of them what the slave once said to an ancient king: "Remember that thou art mortal." When Pedro de Alvarado, the Toniatuh (The Sun) escaped from his enemies during the Sorrowful Night, leaning on his lance to jump across the canal,

he leaped into legend and the feat is commemorated by a street in Mexico City.

HIDDEN TREASURES

The gold in the chronicles of the 16th century was to shine later in tales of hidden treasures that still dazzle us with their distant glamour. Thus the conquerors felt when they beheld far-off cities thought to be of solid silver. Also, in the mining regions where wealth was stupendous, vibrating and unseen bells are still heard, while old women sitting by the fire tell of silver found by mule-drivers when preparing their dinner on the mountain. Those treasures from the mines were to tempt credulous persons in later years, when guerrilla commanders, and most especially bandits, hid them in caves, the maps of which have been lost. There is no famous brigand who has not left a treasure of silver, jewelry and pearls sufficient to pay in cash all the foreign debts of Mexico.

This belief in hidden treasures dates from the time of the Conquest, when certain daring pioneers, while opening a door, found quite a display of wealth, not so great, it is true, as that of Atahualpa, the Inca Emperor who was ordered to fill a room with gold in order to gain his freedom, but nevertheless of such importance that Moctezuma sought to bribe his unwelcome visitors. Despite Cortés's own narratives and those of his historians, Moctezuma's gifts were so splendid that even in our day we consider legendary the great golden and silver discs sent to Cortés when he was in Veracruz. The Spanish conquerors, wishing to be admired by their king and the rest of the world, exaggerated all they saw in the New Continent. An extraordinary episode can be told from every word they wrote. Gold and pearls were not all that appealed to them; there were, besides, rare fruits, beautiful birds, native customs, panoramas with volcanoes, and with water in which their glories are reflected. We read Oviedo y Valdés, Herrera, Gómara, Mendieta, Sahagún, and our astonishment increases continually, until we are able to repeat Juan Ponce de León's exclamation when he landed in Florida in search of the Fountain of Eternal Youth: "Thanks be to God, I have seen something new."

THE SEVEN CITIES OF CIBOLA

Thanks be to God, men did not look for that miraculous fountain and the kingdom of Eldorado, because as soon as they found out that both the magic fountain and the kingdom were but dreams, they returned to face reality. But time was to be left to continue its work. Mexico was to become in the 20th century the paradise of new emotions. When the traveler comes here he no longer looks for the Seven Cities of Cibola wherein Fray Marcos de Niza discovered unsuspected richness—even domestic utensils made of solid gold—; every real article in this country had to suggest something unbelievable. People now come to Mexico to study unexplained hieroglyphics carved in stone. Herein lies the charm of this land of everlasting mystery: her inhabitants explain everything in their own way, as why the rabbit has such long ears, and how drinking water first appeared in Yucatan.

THE SUBTERRANEAN FIANCEE

According to tradition, there is one hidden princess in every cenote (deposit of water found in Yucatan, generally at a great depth in the center of a cavern). There was once in Bolonchen a beautiful maid, the daughter of X. Ulumil Cech (Yucatan) and of Zamná (The Dew). A giant, the god of agriculture, sought her and she was forced to hide in the Cave of Bolonchen. The giant in his anger caused thundering and lightning and earthquakes, and illuminated the open space. He dug deep into the soil until the girl was found. . . . All this means that before reaching water in Yucatan men had to go deep into the earth.

In the origin of every Mexican city there is a singular episode. Sometimes it is the humming bird leading the way to the spot where the Aztecs were to establish the capital of their empire. Then comes perhaps Saint James, the apostle, riding a flying horse bound for America, and ready to help the Spaniards in gaining incredible battles (although Bernal Díaz's sinful eyes cannot behold the victorious apostle). At other times we hear of a flock of doves alighting in the place where the city of Guanajuato was to be erected. There is again, in each city, a Saint more adored than God is in the oldest towns.

Virgins and holy images of the Lord are innumerable, although different in their respective legends. The Catholic hagiography of Mexico is very rich, as was the flora of the new countries through which the explorer traveled day after day, hoping to find one peaceful spot along the way.

THE DEVIL IN THE COUNTRY OF COLORS

Gold, Satan and Death played important rôles during the Colonial times. It seems they went so far as to fight over the first place in legend. D. H. Lawrence once told me that Mexicans hope nothing and believe nothing. But he forgot to add that the Mexican believes in the magical and wonderful. He loves glorious lies which make him forget his sordid life. With the appearance of the Spaniards in Mexico, there came also the problem of Gold, and the Devil's intrigues came to the fore. Historians assert that this respectable personage existed here long before the 16th century, but none of these writers have given any proof of it. Moors and Christians fight against each other in the first sham battles the Spaniards taught to the Indians. It is then that the Devil, disguised as a Moor, makes his victorious entrance into Mexican life. At the moment when the City of Mexico no longer doubts the Devil exists, he appears to Don Juan Manuel de Solórzano, a rich and seemingly happy gentleman, who has begun to feel the pangs of jealousy during one moonlit night. We might say that Satan does not introduce himself as he did to Faust, offering eternal youth in exchange for his soul. Neither does his infernal figure appear as to the watchmaker of Strassburg Cathedral, he who was promised the ability to make a perfect work of art. Nor does he occupy himself in architectural work, as in the Michatoya River of Guatemala, where he built the bridge so the priest could walk upon it.

Don Juan Manuel de Solórzano kills the first man he sees on the street, in obedience to his adviser. When on the following day the city wakes up to hear of a new corpse, and Don Juan still has his honor unavenged, for he has murdered an innocent man, he dashes out of his house and says to another stranger, "You are fortunate, for you know the moment you are going to die"—an extraordinary courtesy. The city has lighted its lamps. I refer to those of legend

and not to public lights, for there were none at the time. The murderer cannot be arrested, but he tells his secret to the priest. Life has become unbearable, and remorse keeps him awake at night, forcing him to listen to mysterious voices such as one paternoster and one Ave Maria for the soul of Don Juan Manuel. One evening he sees his own corpse surrounded by four lighted wax candles, just as Charles the Fifth saw his body in the monastery where he concealed himself to hide his neurasthenia. Now then, one fine morning Don Juan Manuel de Solórzano was found dead on the outskirts of the city. His tongue was hanging out, and his body was swinging from a limb of a tree. He had been hanged with a cord worn by Franciscan monks. . . . Angels had punished him.

THE SPEAKING FIG TREE

The Inquisition archives are filled with the purest gold, according to the Mexican historians who tell us stories of many wonderful happenings. But perhaps except for the metamorphosis of the roses found on the hill of Tepeyac, during a certain day in December, when the Virgin Mary came down from Heaven—as old Juan Diego, the man who cut the roses, says—to show herself to the Indians with an Indian face, there is no more fascinating story of the colonial régime in Mexico than that of the fig tree planted in Saint Philip's home, and covered with blossoms the day he was murdered by Japanese Buddhists. Both the legend of our Lady of Guadalupe and that of the eagle on the cactus, eating the serpent and beheld by the founders of Tenochtitlan, have risen to the grandeur of transcendental myth, that is to say, a new ideology has been formed around them. Philip had been a very mischievous child, the terror of the neighborhood, an anxiety to his family. His father kept a store on the Calle de Plateros—one of the main streets in Mexico City, and the boy had become so bothersome that the old man resolved to send him to Manila in one of the ships trading with the lands of ivory and perfumes. It is said that there was in the yard of Philip's home a faded fig tree, and that the old Negro servant—quite an expensive luxury in those days—predicted that when the tree grew green again Philip would become a saint. And the tree gave forth the news with a

punctuality which would have assured the efficiency of wireless service at that time, although limited to solemn occasions.

PROMENADING IN THE CITY

But legend laughs at those who are hostile to it. Poets are its accomplices and willing to intrigue with it. Whereas, one beautiful day, Vicente Riva Palacio and Juan de Dios Peza agreed to dress it decently, to teach it good manners and to invite it for a long walk in the city, so it should be recognized by former acquaintances. The two writers happened to discover something which had been overlooked: the streets. Explanations were promptly given by each man. Naturally, streets are grateful to those who write about their history, as children are when told an amusing story. Mexico is the country always eager for new things, and above all for promulgating hyperbole. Everything is exaggerated here, even when speaking of Moctezuma's clothes—they say his wardrobe was richer than that of Queen Elizabeth of England. In speaking of Cortés's grandsons, on the occasion of their baptism, some persons even tell of silver bars placed all the way from the main entrance of the palace to that of the church, so the guests might feel more comfortable.

Mexico has been more exaggerated by Mexicans than by visitors. If among two hundred tourists from South America there happen to be some business men, the entire group is referred to as two hundred millionaires looking for an opportunity to invest their money. Newspaper men know perfectly well that stories of the most horrible crimes are the most pleasing reading matter in a country where paradox aims to surpass itself. That is why journalism is always endeavoring to please the readers by serving them all the hot dishes,—the hotter, the better digested. I have been told by one of the experts in these menus that police reports are the easiest to tell, inasmuch as a legend can be formed from the most trivial plot. Optical error on the part of those looking at Mexico from abroad is explained easily, since both Mexicans and the Mexican press are responsible for sketching fictitious panoramas. Frequently foreign novels and newspapers tell of celebrated bandits escaping from jail at Cayenne, aided by a Mexican, Rafael Cortés, for instance. Or again, this very individual kills ten peaceful

pedestrians on a street in such and such an American city. Luckily enough, this happens mostly on the silver screen. Love of publicity, which existed in Mexico before journalism was introduced, is the true spreader of false alarm.

MIRACLES OF THE STREETS

The first post-Cortesian legend of which we know has a strong epigrammatic flavor. It must be kept in mind that all the following deeds occurred on a dark night, and that none of the Spaniards was calm enough when telling of Alvarado's performances to furnish a journalistic report in the manner of our present reporters. However, the chronicler tells us that "Alvarado, on reaching the third sectional cut at the Calzada de Tacuba, pierced with his lance the objects he saw floating on the surface of the water, leaned forward and jumped safely over the ditch." It can be understood readily that pre-Cortesian legend is guilty of the original sin of epigram. The comment on the brave captain when jumping over the ditch so as to prove what opportunity means to speed, is a biting jest. This witticism is the one which decorates legend in the verses of the popular "corrido" (ballad) praising the bullfighter Ponciano Díaz, who is considered by the people as brave as the Cid,—for although he died long ago, he continued to win battles. The "corrido" is the chronicle of daily events augmented by vulgar minds, legend forming the background and the whole a musical story. It tells us of Rosa, Rosita, Rosaura, the girl who died of love; the guerrillero who was the terror of the mainland, and who let himself be surprised and arrested while listening to a beautiful song, or the murderer acting like a personage invented by Pirandello, reaching the banquet and killing the dreadful leader, amidst the astonishment of all the guests. Some persons say the assassin has fled to the United States, and has escaped being shot. This is as important in the study of legend as the story that Cortés's ships were burned, although it has been proved they never were. But the following is still a more serious question: Thomas Alva Edison, the well-known savant who has invented such miraculous things, was born in Mexico, is the scion of an old Mexican family, and was forced to go across the Rio Grande in order to earn his daily bread. There are whispers as to the

manner in which the Latin aviators Emilio Carranza and Ramón Franco met disaster in their flights; the former lost his life due to an American invention consisting of lightning which strikes foreign airships. This faculty of explaining the most elemental phenomenon of Nature, as well as more complicated episodes, shows the variety of themes kept in Mexican brains for every event. The inventors of these fables date from Antonio de Solís, who puts an eloquent speech in the mouth of Hernán Cortés when landing at Veracruz—as if he were in an oratory contest,—up to Don Ramón del Valle Inclán, throwing flowers to a Niña Chole in his “sonata,” they all have bedecked past days as if they were fish looking at their reflections in the aquarium. But Mexico has not produced as yet a writer like Palma, the Peruvian who gave life to unrelated happenings, finding a moving picture plot in any common incident whatever. Who could ever imagine that reporters are the most prolific writers of beautiful legends, giving breath to figures that, born by a caprice of the pen, are unwilling to disappear from the stage when the manipulator tries to hide them?

PERSONAL LEGENDS

Self-legend reports two cases—that of Maximilian’s son is the more pathetic one. It tells us about a man who claimed to be a son of the unfortunate Emperor, and who physically resembled him, especially in the beard. The man attracted considerable attention while in Europe, and Rubén Darío, the great Nicaraguan poet, employed him as private secretary. Some years later we learned that he was shot as a German spy during the Great War. The other case is that of Dr. Atl. This artist, a fine conversationalist and renowned *gourmet*, was more cautious in arranging the scenario of his personal legend. During one of the many civil wars in Mexico, Dr. Atl took possession of the Old Convento de la Merced in Mexico City. A humble bed, with a wooden pillow, following the example of San Francisco de Assisi, was placed in one of the rooms wherein the Doctor’s figure is most frequently seen. A year ago, Dr. Atl told an American newspaper man he was spending his immense fortune in artistic charities, by helping promising young painters and poets of Mexico. However, he said, he had put aside some million of pesos, sufficient for the coming needs of

his austere life. The news, with authentic photographs, was published in Sunday pages of great American papers; and soon, Dr. Atl, like another Valentino, became the recipient of perfumed letters inviting him to buy marble palaces, fantastic tapestry, and even one of the skulls of Christopher Columbus, which are sold by many a *cicerone* in Genoa. Those who desire to listen to the most appalling legends, including that of the dead colonel who appears occasionally at noon by the Fuente de las Focas in the conventual cloister, should try to have Dr. Atl prepare for them one of those menus which are the delight of unexpected guests, with no other rhythm than that of his own steps, and no other voice than his own.

It is true that we Mexicans did not invent the art of printing nor the railroads, but this is due to division of human activities—something was intended for other countries. But it is certain that we had the privilege of inventing legends, and of retaining the exclusive patent for this special work. And as long as Mexico exists, legend will never cease. The wealth of mythology and folk-lore has not nearly been fully explored, neither has the Mexican's indifference to death—so familiar to all. Anything out of the ordinary, as humor, variety and incredulity—all that is contradictory, as Mexico is, lives in Mexican legend.

•

III

THE ART OF THE INDIAN

•

MARY AUSTIN, an authority on the culture and folklore of the Indian, is the author of "The Land of Journey's Ending," "Everyman's Genius," "The American Rhythm," "A Small Town Man," and numerous other books; dramatist and literary critic. She lives in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

THE INDIAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO CULTURE IN THE UNITED STATES

MARY AUSTIN

IN TALKING with you on behalf of the American Indian who is your fellow citizen I am aware that I shall have to tell you much that you do not know before you know what you owe to him. Although I have waited thirty years for such an occasion as this, to meet with a group including another American aboriginal race, I can come tonight with real joy to announce to you (at the very beginning) that at last the American government has taken a real stand of proper appreciation of the American Indian as a part not only of its national life, but of its national culture. Three months ago I went to Washington on a visit which marked the end of nearly forty years of active campaigning to make our government understand that the Indian is an artist and maker of culture. I secured assurance that the government would hereafter do all it could to recover and encourage the arts of the Indian and incorporate them as openly as possible in the culture that they have had such a large part in creating.

It is surprising to the American to know that much of his culture is based on Indian effort, not only the efforts of those living within the American states, but also of those who once inhabited the Central Plateau, who developed the grain we know as Indian corn. We do not know how long ago that was, but it was 20,000 years at least. I understand from the Federal Bureau of Plant Industry at Washington

that there is in existence fossil corn about the length of a man's thumb, which is at least this old. It must have been 20,000 years before that that corn grew as wild grass on the highlands of Mexico. Consider what it meant to the early colonists in North America to find a new food containing all the necessary elements of the best cereals of Europe for at the time that the English colonists began to settle along the eastern coast corn had reached the high development under which we now know it. All the varieties had appeared. Among the things we turn up among the mound builders are corn poppers. No one knows where they originated. They had popcorn and syrup and were accustomed to pour the syrup over the corn. Popcorn balls probably came from the Indians.

Consider, again, what it meant to the colonists. The grains of Europe which could be transplanted and raised here were wheat, barley, oats and rye. All these required that the land should be cleared before they could be planted. The settlers had to have a reasonably level place before these cereals could be successfully planted and harvested. After they were harvested they had to be housed. Before they could be palatable they had to be ground. There must be mills and millstones and water wheels. All this would have meant much labor for the English colonists. The land was one untouched wood from New England to Florida and west from the coast to the Mississippi River. It would have meant work almost impossible for the settlers to carry out before they could have raised their own foodstuffs. They found the corn, already acclimated, all the methods of cultivating it already worked out. That grain did not require an uninterrupted clear space in which to be grown successfully. One could take a hoe and stir a bit of the earth at the very doorstep and raise a hill of corn. Another point is that the corn was adapted to all the climates as none of the European grains had been adapted. The same types of corn could be raised in the Dakotas, on the plains of Kansas, in Georgia, in the middle of the forests of New England. Another important fact is that corn could be used before it was ripe. And when the corn is ripe it is not necessary to build storage places for it. It can be left standing in the field through the winter. The corn did not have to be ground. It could be easily prepared by the women. Nothing

was necessary but to soak it for a time in lye water. Or it could be parched, pounded and made palatable.

We must remember the long years of patient and devoted effort that were required to produce this corn that the colonists found. Taking care of the corn was a religious exercise. This was a real factor in the moral and spiritual development of the Indian. There must be rites and prayers and clowning so that the corn might grow fat and be happy. So the whole cultural life of the Indian grew up around corn. The soul of the Indian went into the soul of the corn.

There are other foods that the Indian brought. From him we took the potato, the tomato, celery, a number of varieties of beans and melons. There is still a discussion as to whether Mexico produced the first watermelon. The pumpkin came with the corn. The Indian had worked out that group of three foodstuffs: first the corn to grow; next the beans to grow, and climb on the corn; then the squash to run over the ground and smother the weeds. This is the most effective combination that can be worked out. The peanut is also a gift of the Indian. This was one of the most important food items in the last war. De Soto found the peanut among the Indians in the south, the Indians of the Savannahs.

Maple sugar was another valuable gift. The founders of the United States were easily sixty days from any source of sugar. It would have been hard to fill this need. Maple sugar could be made from the trees planted by nature and required only the reaping. This is the sort of thing that made the rapid settling of the eastern coast a possibility. We had our sugar in the west, the tall cactus produces a fruit which makes a palatable sugar.

Everywhere the Indian had sought out and by experimentation had arrived at the necessary foodstuffs. In the north he had invented a method of keeping meat. The smokehouse was invented by the northeastern Indians, but it had not been carried to perfection. Along the Canadian border where the buffalo roamed the Indians had invented a method of preserving meat which has played an important part in the New World. Beef was completely dried and then pounded to a powder. This was mixed with the melted fat. This was extremely nutritious. A few pounds would last a man many weeks on the trail. A great deal of Antarctic exploration was made on pemmican, and

this is still made in Canada. Until the tin can arrived, this was almost the only way in which meat could be preserved.

Most of the exploration and colonization of America was set forward at least 200 years by the foodstuffs that we took over from the Indian. In taking that we took the fruit of his labor and watchfulness for thousands and thousands of years. We have to think what it did for the world at large as well as for our own country. Before the time that Indian food was given to the world every few years there was a famine in some part of Europe, but gradually, with the coming of the American potato and corn, famine disappeared out of Europe. They are the most adaptable of all the foodstuffs that have been offered by the New World.

It was this comparatively easy access to foodstuffs that made possible the enormous material development of the American colonies. There was a type of corn everywhere in the United States according to the grain itself and the habits of the people. The *tortilla* is the special Mexican corn bread. It is made of pounded corn, which is more glutinous than the type raised in New England. In Italy there is much the same type. The kind of corn bread that was developed by the American colonists north of the Potomac River was a corn cake, mixed in a batter and poured on a flat rock and cooked. This is the parent of the American hot cake. In going west the colonists were accompanied largely by the corn and griddle cake, a food that could be made quickly.

You perhaps have not realized how much food has to do with culture. In any country where you find original arts you find original foods. I know of no symptom in America so disquieting as the disappearance of local food cultures and the coming in of the tin can. When all of the food of the country is divorced from the country, when it has no roots in the traditions and life of the people, that country loses something. We owe it to the Indian that we have as many foods as we do have with traditions and associations.

I must mention other foods used in connection with certain of our holidays. The rhythm of the climate, seed time and harvest time, set the pace of the holidays. We do not choose them. As a matter of fact the land itself chooses them. It was not a coincidence that the Continental Congress was held when it was. Most of the members

of the Congress had large estates and farms and the Congress was called between planting and hoeing when men could attend it. It is not a coincidence that our Thanksgiving happened just when it did. It occurred almost coincidentally with the harvest festival of the American Indians. In Europe long before Christianity and during the first thousand years of Christianity, people still held harvest festivals. The last sheaf and the first fruits of the field were carried into the church. The Indians always gave thanks to the god of the harvest. I wonder how many of us know that it was the offering of the first fruits or the last fruits of the field that first taught man agriculture. Primitive man came to realize that if he returned next year where he did not pick all the seed this year he would find more. It grew upon his mind that there was some force in the universe which was gratified to have something left, a few stalks of grain, a few nuts ungathered. Among the Indians in our country there are still a few stalks of grain not gathered, but left for that force which makes for unity in the universe. This old custom was the beginning of man's sense of God in the earth as exhibited in the common things of field and forest. And so we in the United States have reinstated a pagan festival. It is a genuine religious festival.

Of what is a Thanksgiving dinner made up? It begins possibly with oysters or clam broth, which has a little cream in it. The Indians did not have cream, so they beat up hickory nuts until they were creamy. Then there is turkey stuffed with American chestnuts. Then the cranberry, which does not grow naturally in any country but the United States and was introduced by the Indian. There is celery, which is an American plant. White potatoes, which came from Mexico, sweet potatoes probably brought first from Yucatán and introduced first in the South. Mince pie, an English dish, but the Indians themselves had a kind of conserve made of meat and dried wild plums. The children have popcorn balls, which are thoroughly Indian. Then we smoke cigars and drink coffee, both absolutely Indian. Late at night we have a cup of chocolate flavored with vanilla, also Indian.

That is not all the Indians gave us. I am leaving out all the practical things such as trails and knowledge of the country and climate. Did you ever realize what the pioneer women went through trying

to raise their babies? Now there are a half-dozen artificial foods for babies. In those early days there must have been many times when people were reduced to extremity. The Indians had papooses. What did they do if the mother's milk gave out? I discovered this in all the diaries and cookbooks of New England. The Indian women made a very good food for babies by boiling corn meal many hours, straining it, making hickory nut cream and combining them in certain proportions. On this the little Puritan babies were raised.

Then there are the medicinal herbs which the Indian knew. They gave dyestuffs. There were a thousand and one uses of the plants in the forests which the Indians taught to the American settlers. This was a valuable element in our American life down to the Civil War. We still use many of the herbs and dyes which the Indians brought us. In the west we still use those things a great deal. An herb belonging to the celery family has been an object of commerce up and down the Rio Grande for 2,000 years and still is. All this has been incorporated into our efficiency and we have prospered with it and have neglected to give the Indian his due.

Nearly all of these originated in Mexico: corn and certain kinds of melons and pumpkins, fruits and potatoes, chocolate, vanilla and cotton. At that time there were no supplies of cotton nearer than Asia. It was in the United States that they found the longest cotton staple in the world. This is grown especially in New Mexico and Arizona and is derived from a cotton plant developed by the Indian.

There are many things we owe to the Indians which we still do not know about. These are being discovered all the time. It was the Indian that saved us from the stupidity of repeating the names of the old country, such as "New York" and "Amsterdam." The Indian names were so effective and descriptive. We took many of them over. "Missouri River"—Big Muddy! What could be more appropriate? These Indian names give us that association of the land which makes for the best kind of patriotism. It touches the country with a feeling of tenderness and humor and romance.

The country is full of interesting legends for the children which we do not make sufficient use of. There are stories by the score all over the country. We are beginning to rake them up, especially in New England in connection with tercentenary celebrations. We have

allowed many of them to become corrupted. They have been written and told by people who worked them over into an imitation of European folk tales. We should demand that Indian stories be told as Indian stories and for the Indian value they have. There is scarcely any incident in our life that cannot be drawn directly out of our own soil. The land is full of clever Indian stories applicable to the American temperament. It is full of genuine romantic elements, but we have sentimentalized them beyond words. We have this language of the inner culture. We have beauty and poetry that our Indians have made. We have despised this inner culture and allowed machines to crush it out, because it was associated with a pagan religion. These Indian people found a way in their poetry to express the rhythm of the land in which they lived. I can tell an Indian poem when I hear it, I can tell from what part of the country it is, whether from the plains or the seashore, or the forests. The rhythm repeats the character of the land. Our own poets struggled for years and we did not have good poetry for a long time because it was written in European rhythms. Not until recently have our poets given way to their impulses and begun to express poetry in the rhythms of the country. This was not done until the poets began to study Indian poems. I think we are now producing the best poetry being produced anywhere in the English language. The Indians have helped to show us the way to express the deepest feeling of America in the rhythm of the land.

The same thing is true with music, a field which has as yet scarcely been touched. There is a tremendous storehouse of native American themes.

Painters have taken hints from the Indian arts. In Mexico the painters have allowed the Indian sense for the essential thing, its significant form and line, to govern their work. Mexican painting is leading the world in originality and force. Painters have come to the Santa Fe and Rio Grande because the Indian helps them to free themselves from the traditions and inhibitions and influences of alien rhythms and alien sense of form.

We are looking in North America and here in Mexico, the young generation everywhere is looking for a new common myth for the great adventure of the soul. After all, this is what religion is. We

have outgrown our old myths for the most part. The first Americans had created myths of their own. There is in existence a book of Genesis among the Zuni Indians, which in literary form is quite as fine as the Hebrew book, and in spiritual conception matches the best of our modern science. It comes nearer to the way in which we think the world was created. It sees life as a continuous movement. This is why many Indians feel as they do about death. They do not entertain a morbid feeling about it. In Mexico the Day of Death is rather a cheerful celebration. The dead are invited back. This grows out of the Indian conception of life and death as part of a continuing process that repeats itself. They are not afraid of death or are not morbid about it because they know they will be re-absorbed into the cosmic order. "Gitche Manito" means unclaimed spirit, spirit which is available, a tremendous reservoir of spirit on which we can draw. All the ceremonies and rites of the Indian revolve around this philosophy, this spirit which can be drawn into the field to produce good crops and into man's spirit to make him a better being.

There is a religion waiting for this seeking generation. The myth is ready and waiting to be used. It only remains for us to be humble enough to turn back. We must learn to use the myth as the outward form of the inward experience, not to mistake the myth for fact, but to take it as the symbol of the experience.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FOLK ART AND SOPHISTICATED ART

MARY AUSTIN

WE HAVE been passing in the United States through an experience similar to that of Mexico in the field of art. But we must in the beginning discriminate in the use of certain terms which have a somewhat different connotation in the United States than in Mexico. We have found we could not use the term "arts of the people" or "popular arts." Anything popular in the United States is a thing that sells. So we have had to go back to an older term and talk about "folk art."

It was not the original intention of the founders of the American Republic that there should be a folk. A folk is a people completely enclosed by its environment, receiving no influence from any other environment. Europe was full of folk and it was the belief of the founders of the Republic that through the institution of the public school, in which all would learn the same thing at the same time, there would be no such thing as groups. But the continent of America was too big for us. The environmental surroundings were too different. The groups which achieved satisfactory adjustment to environment took on the color of that environment just as tribes would everywhere. The Kentucky mountaineers, the Dakota farmers—each became a distinct group. As a result we have many groups in the United States entitled to be called folk groups.

What are these groups producing as a result of their adjustment to their environment? In the southwest we have two distinct groups, the Indian and the Spanish-speaking native population. It is difficult to find a word for them. They resent being called "Spanish Americans," but they do not mind being called "natives," so we have compromised on the term "Spanish Colonial." Spanish Colonial art and customs there are in a better state of preservation than I have found in Mexico. There has been less interruption and better examples of Spanish Colonial art are to be found.

The development of folk art, which is determined by the adjustment of the folk to the environment, is a self-conscious process. It is not a form of activity, not a product, but a process. Folk art is the expression of that complete adjustment between man and his environment which we think of as natural to the psychology of the period. We see the same result in lower forms, which we call by explicit names. One pattern is an oak tree, another a squash vine. One pattern of animal life is a bird, another a lion, another a man. The tendency of folk art is always to have that same explicitness of form so that we can always recognize it. For example, this type of pottery comes from a certain tribe, this blanket from another.

Luther Burbank discovered how to break the pattern. He made an attack upon the integrity of the pattern by crossing one plant life with another, as far removed from it as possible. The result was the creation of a totally new type. And yet one cannot be too sure that

these supposedly new types had never been in existence before. They might have been in existence but unknown to man. Probably some of these types Burbank produced were very old types.

The same thing must happen in alterations of art forms. There must be violent crossing between types of art as expressed by a folk and new types which would express new experience. The alteration of folk types is often so slow that it may be said not to exist. For example, we find that the American Indian produces types practically the same as those discovered in the ruins of the earliest Indian civilizations. When there is a tremendous attack on the pattern, as there was when the Spanish entered Mexico, then the pattern is broken and wavers, and new types are produced corresponding to the new experience. The Indian could not be sophisticated. He only knew his own situation, and this coming into contact with sophisticated life and art constituted a complete rending of his cultural pattern.

Everything a folk does has relation to its pattern of living. It does not make art an extra adornment. The folk people adorn everything they make use of in the process of living. Basically, folk art is concerned with keeping between man and God that intimate relation and sympathetic adjustment which is necessary to primitive man. The sophisticated man can depend upon himself. He does not depend upon prayers and ceremonies to keep himself in good health, but he depends upon the resources of the modern world to keep him in good health. The primitive man had no such dependence. His whole relation to the universe was mystical. By mystical practices he tried to keep up that relation between himself and environment which kept him happy in the world. Every common thing that the primitive man made, if only a stone hatchet, was beautifully made, made with all the man had to put into it. When he progressed far enough to add decoration to his work it was always a decoration or design which served an explicit purpose, that of keeping him close to divinity.

All among the southwestern Indians decoration is a symbolic thing furthering the relations between man and the heavenly powers. The symbols on the water jars of the Zuni Indians today are symbols of prayer to the water power. All primitive symbols go back to man's sense of his relation to the divinity.

This is true of early Mexican art, although we have lost the con-

nection in many cases. Nearly all the flowers used are flowers sacred to some goddess. The Indian made a decoration of the instrument used to cut out the heart, and he wore it in the same way that a good Christian wears the cross. After the breaking of the pattern by the intrusion of Christianity, the symbolism no longer meant anything to the people for whom the articles were made. The Indian had lost, so to speak, his audience, and consequently part of his incentive to work. New utensils came in in place of those he made, and the sense of design of the older articles was lost on those who bought them. If you go through the markets anywhere in Mexico you will find the Indian making all the things he once made, but no longer in the thought of their being particularly useful. They have become play-things, souvenirs.

No doubt we have done away with many things that are made by folk in any region simply because of our more sophisticated civilization, which draws from all the other civilizations, and they have been superseded by articles of greater utility and in some cases beauty. It is for us to decide what articles made by our folk can be worked into our pattern of life, to reawaken in us our sense of life. Do not go about buying souvenirs but buy something that can be woven into your life pattern; in this machine age when the machine has come between us and divinity, the American home is more like a museum than any other home in the world. It consists of things that are not bought because they keep men closer to that immaterial reality, because they are useful and fulfill a design of the lives of the people of that home, but they are bought in the same way that pack rats collect everything they can lay their paws on. Our homes represent the places we have been to rather than the way we live.

Many of the Indian things are essentially curios, but we can select certain things which belong to the modern life pattern, and then educate the public. We do not need to do anything with the Indian. He is willing to adapt, and has a great power of adaptability. It is for us to reconstruct our needs. We have an organization for the advancement of Indian arts. We began with the dealer. Just now there is only one dealer in New Mexico who is really catering to popular art. Most dealers want things simple because they sell. We taught the

dealers what they needed to know about good examples of Indian art and the uses they would fill.

We live in houses which are true to a pattern. We furnish them according to a pattern. We find out how very adaptable Indian patterns are to modern living. Buy nothing and put nothing in your houses that is not true to your own pattern of living.

There is something happening in Mexico that we want to have happen in the United States, the coalition of folk art and sophisticated art. In Mexico we have a fine beginning in the art of Diego Rivera, who gathers the splendid elements of art from all the world and pours them into the Mexican consciousness. The tendency of all sophisticated art is the over-elaboration of technique, so sophisticated art is always having to go through periods of renaissance in order to get back in touch with folk art.

Folk art and sophisticated art must be brought together through a knowledge of what each one of the races contributes before we can produce out of the whole a pattern adequate for modern civilization.

RENÉ d'HARNONCOURT, an authority on popular arts in Mexico, is in charge of the exhibit of Mexican arts organized by the Carnegie Corporation and exhibited at the leading art galleries in the United States during 1930-1931.

MEXICAN POPULAR ART

COUNT RENÉ D'HARNONCOURT

It is well to consider the atmosphere and the basis of the Mexican civilization that produced Mexican popular art. When Cortés came to Mexico he found a number of small nations, each with distinct civilization, like the Aztecs, the Tarascans, etc. The Spanish conquerors, by imposing their religion, their language, and many habits of life, as well as by actually destroying the manifestations of those individual civilizations, wiped out whatever there was of pre-conquest civilizations. They destroyed the Tarascan type, the Aztec type, but they did not destroy the basic elements of the Indian cultures.

When I refer to Indian civilization I mean only the central part of Mexico, because the peoples in the extreme south of Mexico, while in the limits of the Republic, are a combination of Guatemalan and Indian civilizations. In the extreme north there is a civilization much like that of the Indian of North America. The state of Chiapas and the border states in the north are excluded when I refer to Mexican civilization.

After having destroyed manuscripts, language and religion, the Spaniards who came in slowly to colonize this country during the colonial time were unconsciously influenced by the Indians. The Spanish conquest destroyed the several small civilizations that had dwelt together for hundreds of years and that had produced monuments like

the pyramids and temples of Mexico, but it did not touch the human interests of the Indians. The artistic conceptions of life held by the Spaniards were very different from those of the Indians. Therefore, the Indian, even if he tried to reproduce the models the Spaniards brought, could not do so because his way of looking at things, his feelings, were so different. This was the beginning of the Mexican civilization that is based on both foreign forms and on Indian conception.

Considering the very first years after the conquest—we do not know of many objects made in the early 16th century, and the very few that are left to us show that their creation was not yet really harmonious. You find that at the very first the Aztec tried to use Spanish elements without really blending them, but as time went on the Indian nature proved to be stronger than the conception of the conqueror. He assimilated the elements and made them entirely his own. We find upon observing Mexican applied art of colonial days almost every object used by the Spaniards, and the difference between Indian and Spanish is often only very slight.

Many times we even find the pattern used by the Spaniard, and the only slight difference might show in the arrangement. Take for example, printing in Oaxaca in 1840. Although the actual types and the machine used were from Europe, still the result is typically Mexican. I have seen samples of those early printed leaves where the letters were not used as letters but as decorations, and decorative material for the heading was distributed all over the page. This is an excellent example of the fact that the Indian could make out of foreign elements, combined with his own conception, something uniquely his own.

During the colonial time, of course, most of the foreign elements were Spanish or Italian. In the 18th century we added quite a number of Chinese foreign elements that in most cases did not come directly from China, but rather through France and Europe where, by this time, Chinese tiles were much in use.

It is probably because this Mexican civilization did not make a proper unit of the Spanish empire that it was separated from Spain. There was a group of people living under rules not adapted to them, a group of people yearning for a kind of self-expression appropriate to

their own conception of life. Finally this ambition, this aim for independence, exploded in the beginning of the 19th century.

It is curious to find that political independence in Mexico did not result at once in cultural independence. The aim for independent culture was not yet clear.

The best examples we have of thoroughly Mexican art in colonial days are the paintings that were copied from the Spanish. The artist had the ambition to make a Spanish painting, but could not do it because his own conception was stronger than his ability to cover it. So when the nation became independent, Mexico did not yet realize that it had a culture back of it, that it had a basis that entitled it to proclaim its own civilization. It still felt dependent in matters of taste, in matters of the arts of civilization, in general, upon Europe; and, at this time, Paris was the center of the world's civilization.

It was natural that as soon as they freed themselves from the Spanish domination, Mexicans should adopt France as the center of its cultural ambition. In the 19th century we have exactly the same situation as in colonial times, only that in the colonial days the Spanish form element is adopted by the Indian and re-created in an Indian way, and in the 19th century it is the French form element that is adopted.

The first time that Mexico proclaimed itself probably was in the time of the Madero revolution. This is the first time that Mexican intellectuals proclaimed themselves Mexican, that they chose Mexican subjects for their work and tried to reproduce the same in a Mexican way. The best manifestation of this so-called Mexican Renaissance is a fresco executed by the syndicate of painters headed by Rivera and Orozco.

From 1910 until now we have had conscious expression. Of course, you realize that the conscious expression of Mexican civilization is only to be found among intellectuals in the cities, because the Indian in the village still works on popular arts, the lacquer box, etc., without any self-conscious realization. He works in the same spirit as the artist of the colonial period or of the 19th century. You find that the Indian in the village very often copies foreign art, and without knowing it himself, puts in the Indian conception.

It is very difficult to talk about Mexican popular arts, because in

colonial days, most of the art objects that are now classified as Mexican popular arts were not made for the use of the people themselves. The lacquer that today is used entirely for the purposes of the Indians themselves, was a very highly developed art in Michoacan in the 18th and 19th centuries. The finest objects were made for the use of the nobles and privileged classes. We find a number of crafts in Mexico that from colonial days to today have shifted from the rural classes down to the village. They have increased very much in character and have lost considerably in technique and quality.

This, of course, has to do with the development of civilization itself. In colonial days the only market for fine art products was the church and the nobility. Most of the members of the clergy as well as the nobility imported what they needed of paintings and other applied art objects from Spain, or had them made by Mexicans who had been in school in Europe or had adopted the European school. But in the interior, especially in certain towns of Michoacan, where there were Indian workmen who were exclusively for the nobles and for the clergy and where there could, therefore, be a relatively bigger reward, they were able to produce high grade objects of art.

In the 19th century there began a demand for things on the part of the bourgeoisie, the tradesmen in the small towns. These people also began to become interested in acquiring art objects. The quality naturally was not as high as in the colonial days, the prices offered were not as high, but the wider demand gave a bigger field for the workmen. The criterion of the consumer was not as Spanish as it had been in colonial days. There were many *mestizos* among the consumers, therefore, the character of the art objects became more Mexican.

In the present days almost the only market for real Mexican things is the native village itself, with the exception of a very small part that is made for tourist trade and has nothing to do with real Mexican art. Many Mexicans are now trying very hard to replace all popular art with foreign art. For Mexican popular art the worst danger is the gasoline tank. In Michoacan, in a certain village, a woman came to meet us carrying water in a lovely pottery jar, apologizing because she could not bring water in the tin gasoline can.

Another thing that is dangerous to Mexican popular art is the introduction of tin cans to replace gourds. Every Indian in the interior

took his bath standing in a barrel, giving himself a shower with a lacquer gourd. When they saw the first tin cans all shiny and bright, the gourd was scorned, and now almost all these gourds are replaced by tin cans.

In the interior villages there is still a certain demand for popular arts among the Indians. Now, the Indian workman has to work only for his neighbor's taste. Therefore, he is able to express himself with entire freedom. He does not try to think what his client is going to prefer or what is just now the style. He is able to do exactly as he pleases because he can identify himself with the taste of the man who lives the same kind of life as himself.

Mexican popular art of today is really popular because it is made by the people and for the people. First, it is derived in many cases from an art that you can call Mexican applied art, but cannot call Mexican popular art, because in the colonial days it was made by the Indians but not for their own use, and not by any Indian but by only a select few, and by people who by trade were already more skilled than the big mass of people. The old *zerape* used by the large *haciendado* as a blanket, the potteries from Guanajuato and Oaxaca, were made in colonial days with so much refinement, requiring so much time, they could not possibly have been made for the big masses.

The greatest danger at the present, the influence one is most afraid of now for Mexican popular arts, is the machine-made article. Villages that even ten years ago would use the most beautiful, purest manifestation of Mexican art, have gone back in a most terrible way. For example, a village in the state of Jalisco. Its reputation as a village goes beyond pre-conquest days, and in the 19th century it produced the most beautiful things in the Mexican territory, but the ability of the people was in real danger. They were so eager to copy that as soon as demand for foreign things began in Mexico and because they wanted to make a living and keep their trade, they admitted the foreign thing. I have seen copies of almost anything horrible in the world, from a bulldog with the national insignia to copies of German plaster casts. It is to be hoped that the demand for those things will decrease because the taste of the patron is increasing. Handmade products will not be so cheap any longer as the imported

machine-made ones. Wealthy people who have traveled and have acquired a certain amount of taste, we hope will not insist on having national bulldogs any more. And for the poor people I think that soon the machine-made plaster cast will replace the copy in clay.

The market among the Indians themselves is, of course, almost surely lost, because the object that is only for practical use would always be cheaper if it is imported on a big scale.

The very best thing, therefore, that we can hope for Mexican popular art is this: that the very best individuals, the very best workmen, will stick to their trade and improve it; that popular art will be restricted to the very best productions, and with the old tradition in time be perfected. I do not believe that the large volume of production throughout the country can be "saved."

DIEGO RIVERA'S paintings on the walls of the Ministry of Education and the National Preparatory School in Mexico City and the National Agricultural Academy at Chapingo have fired the imagination of the art world.

MEXICAN PAINTING

DIEGO RIVERA

IN THE study of art in Mexico it is necessary to distinguish the historical factor from the present-day factor. There are two factors that are of great importance; first, the great masses of Indians, of peasants, and of workers. The other factor is the foreign influence from the time of the Conquest up to the present.

At the time of the Conquest the Spanish foreigner endeavored at

once to destroy and to influence the Indian culture which he found, more or less, as the colonists from England and from France endeavored to do in the case of the United States. But in the United States the indigenous population was much less than in Mexico. The culture found by the colonists in North America was not of the high degree of that found by the Spanish in Mexico. Therefore, the European culture in North America was able to extend itself very rapidly. Another reason for this difference is to be found in the philosophy of the colonists of America in those early days. In the case of France and England—whether French Protestants or Catholics, English Puritans or any other denomination—the colonists represented in Europe the left group. They came not only to conquer, but to till the land with their own hands. In the case of the Spanish colonies it was different. The conquerors represented the right wing of the conservative party, so that when they came to Mexico they did not come to till the land, but to conquer. During the whole period of the Spanish colonization in Mexico not a single Spaniard put his hands to the plow or to a mining instrument. Therefore, they used the labor of the indigenous people. They saw that above the richness and wealth of the country measured by lands and mines and precious stones, the greatest wealth was to be found in the Indian himself. The Indian was at once considered the factor in the development of the country far above any of the material resources of the land. At the time of the Conquest, from Cortés to his least soldier, the Spaniards may be considered more than colonists; they are to be considered as managers of men, managers of labor.

As allies to the Indians in those days there were two important groups: the clergy, representing the papacy, which had protested against the exploitation of the Indians by those representing the empire, inasmuch as even at that time there was a distinct battle between the empire and the papacy. The methods by which the Indian was exploited by the civil authorities were always objected to by the ecclesiastical representatives. Both of them had at heart the same desire to exploit the Indian, but the method employed by the clergy had to be more subtle because they lacked the military power, whereas the methods employed by the civil administrators, with the power of the king behind them, were more brutal and direct. The civil admin-

istrator was imbued with the idea of doing away with the indigenous culture. For that reason the masters of painting were assassinated, men and children were likewise destroyed in the public squares. Books of the ancient Mexicans were burned in a pile in the main square of Mexico City, and the conquerors made the boast that the pile was higher than the spires of the present Cathedral. It is also worthy of note that the Spanish conquerors soon saw the formation of Mexican society in those days. It was seen as being more or less in the form of a pyramid like their temples. At the bottom was the great illiterate mass, and as the pyramid proceeded upwards culture became apparent. The conquerors soon saw that if the upper part was destroyed they would be able to destroy the culture and arts and sciences of the Mexican society living at the bottom.

The Spanish conquerors also used the method of dividing the tribes against each other. They endeavored to provoke wars and misunderstandings between the different tribes. One tribe might be used as an ally of the Spaniard to do away more effectively with the culture of the country.

The Mexican priests endeavored to gain the good will of the Indians against the fury of the Spanish soldiers, and in doing so they necessarily had to take cognizance of the culture of the Indians from the very beginning, so a series of compromises was effected between the clergy and the indigenous masses. The Virgin of Guadalupe was instituted and accepted by the Indians. Also the Indian worship was allowed, only covering it with a façade of Catholicism. On the other hand, the Indians accepted the Catholic rites.

It may be seen that the tradesmen of Mexico had their antecedents during the colonial period in the group of masters who came over from Spain of Hebrew and Moorish extraction, such as the silver-smiths, the workers in leather, etc. There also developed another industry, the textile industry, the workers in tapestries, which with the others mentioned formed a basis which made a sort of alliance with the native tradesmen.

The trades in which the different social groups might engage were carefully fixed. By this the Indian was prohibited from being master tradesman in any of the trades because of the fear of his ability to gain a position of prominence and the danger that would result for

the foreign tradesmen. Also the Indian was prevented from entering the field of art, architecture, painting, etc. He could not do any of the portrait work which was in such demand at the time. He could only do the decorative part of the painting. He was unable to rise above the plane of the ordinary worker. He was supposed to be at the beck and call of the master artist of foreign extraction, but he himself could not assume that position. There was a group of officials called overseers and it was their particular function to inspect any work of art which was finished in any of the public buildings or churches and in case they found anything not in accordance with the orthodox ideas of the arts it was completely destroyed.

This is a typical example of the methods used by Spanish tyranny over the conquered peoples in Mexico, an example which cannot possibly be duplicated in the methods of the English colonists in North America.

In the 18th century under the leadership of the liberal King Charles III, the Academy of Fine Arts was established in Mexico, but with this proviso, that masters of European art were sent in order to implant the European form of art in this country and to utilize in particular the Mexican talent that was native to the country. Previous to this period there were a few painters in Mexico of Spanish origin. There were excellent painters in Mexico, but it must be noted that they were of Spanish origin and not, as some Mexican critics of that period have tried to insist, Mexican artists. The influence of the Dutch and Flemish schools persisted in the work of the Mexican painters because of their influence in this country.

You know, of course, that the realization of the independence of Mexico was brought about by a different stratum of people than the one which initiated that battle for independence. There has been a continuous battle on the part of the Indian himself against the power of the Spanish conquerors from the very day of the Conquest, and every day during the three hundred years of their domination. The Yaqui Indians in the north, from the day of the arrival of the Spaniards to this very day, have battled incessantly against the exploitation by the Spaniards and their descendants. The initiation of the war of independence was made by a small group of bourgeoisie who represented a rather small minority of the conquerors. Hidalgo and

his group of revolutionists had come in contact with the masses of Indians and had caught the inspiration from them. In Mexico the great mass of peasants and the small group of bourgeoisie which initiated the independence of Mexico were not able to bring about independence with the same efficiency as in the United States or even in South America. This may be partly due to the lack of cohesion among the leaders or the poverty of the peasants. By 1821 Vicente Guerrero, an Indian, was fighting desperately with a mere handful of followers in the mountains of Guerrero, and there remained a few scattered groups who felt that the war of independence was a failure.

So it was that in this period there seemed to be a feeling on the part of this group of Mexican society, the bourgeoisie, that there was more danger on the part of the liberal current in Spain than on the part of the Mexican revolutionists, and they felt they must take a hand in this battle of independence in order to safeguard their own social order. They feared a great deal more the Mexican deputies in Spain than the Mexican revolutionists on the field, and so they came over to the cause of independence. Thus the intrusion of that comic opera emperor, Iturbide, coincides exactly with the sending of Mexican artists to Rome in order that they might learn art there and bring it back to the empire here. At the time we find that because of the weakening of the social structure there was a flowering of native Mexican painting. The artist was at the time not prohibited from painting religious images, but was free to paint whatever he desired. We have a few pictures of that period which are very good. With the weakening of the colonial power we see the work of such painters as Tres Guerras, who was a master of plastic creation and had in his personality the genius of a painter, a sculptor and an architect. Excepting that of Juárez there was a rapid succession of different governments which came to steal and lie and to weaken the whole social structure during the 19th century and which gave away half of the territory of the Republic. Nevertheless, even during the dictatorship of Díaz there was a blooming of the popular arts of Mexico. But during all this time the same social caste system was still in power. This system endeavored to develop for itself a sort of privileged artist. The substitution of the labor government of Juárez by the absolute government of Díaz once more brought this caste into power. It was in

that period that the Mexican Indian was persecuted. The Yaqui Indians who sought to defend their lands were taken to the unhealthy lands in the south to die. It was then that the Mexican laborer was persecuted and brought to Mexico City and then sent to work in the tobacco fields.

Those at the top of the social pinnacle were in power and dominated the situation through tyranny. The continuation of this group is to be found in the so-called Mexican intellectual group. There were a few very poor examples of art resulting from this group of the Díaz regime. Examples are to be found in the unfinished building of the legislative palace, which is a poor copy of an inferior building of French origin, and the National Theatre, which is also a poor copy of the decadent French art of the 19th century and of which most of the present-day Mexicans feel very proud.

And so at the time the popular art of Mexico, the only real art of Mexico, was persecuted. By a police order the pulque shops were not permitted to be painted by some of the excellent Mexican artists of that period. This continued until 1910 when under the leadership of Zapata and Carranza the Revolution was brought about. This Revolution, which in the beginning was somewhat distorted because of the small and weak petit bourgeois, Madero, and the great landowner, Carranza, gave opportunity for the creation of a national bourgeoisie group or party. This group does not have and will not have a basis of national economy because the economy of Mexico depends a great deal upon foreign capital, especially the capital of Wall Street. This phenomenon is to be found in all of the weak countries of the world today.

This bourgeoisie movement liberated the popular arts and had its influence throughout the masses so that the popular arts flourished at the time. And so it was that when the landowner Carranza failed and General Obregón came into power there was a group of Mexican artists that were able to popularize the art of Mexico, following the leadership and inspiration of General Obregón. They were able to popularize the art of Mexico by bringing it within the walls of the primary schools. This group of painters, called the syndicate of painters and sculptors, has extended generally throughout the nation today.

If you will visit the department of drawing of any school of Mexico you will see the magnificent results.

During the 19th century, before the movement of the present day, which promises hundreds of interesting artists, you will find, in addition to anonymous and official artists, three names of worth. The first one is José Maria Velasco, a great landscape painter, a man who adores nature and has done a great deal for art.

The second painter is Felix Parra, a great man of that epoch, who was one of the first to see and interpret the pre-colonial art of Mexico. He was really the first one to be able to direct and control the current of the development of this pre-colonial art. This art, because of its plastic significance, may be the very one today which may be able to interpret the force of the peasant group and the industrial values as typified in the United States.

The third name is the greatest of all, Gaudalupe Posada, an engraver. Posada is powerful, not only because of the quality of his work, but also because of its quantity, he having executed more than 15,000 of these engravings. The most sophisticated, and yet the most refined, may find satisfaction in the powerful work of Posada. His work can compare only with the great masters such as Goya. This master illustrated all of the popular songs of Mexico, all of its romances, and was able to engrave all of its sufferings and happiness. When the Revolution started he illustrated the small, illegal newspapers of the Revolution. In the same way he had illustrated the prayers of Mexico, which had been as narcotic and opium to its great sufferings. Posada, with no other materials at his command than his small sheet of zinc, may be considered the older brother of the Mexican painters of today.

CARLOS MERIDA, whose "painting pivots on color," is of Maya stock. His exhibit at the National Academy, Mexico City, marked an early stage in the artistic revolution in Mexico.

FOLK ARTS OF GUATEMALA—TEXTILES AND MUSIC

CARLOS MERIDA

A LITTLE more than twelve years ago popular artistic manifestations of our people became conscious first by sympathy and later by a growing interest, resulting from our unconscious appreciation and enthusiasms, which have within them the undeniable means to the finest æsthetic expression.

There are at present many who are dignifying with noble conceptions the popular artistic spirit of our America, thus proving the destiny of our great Latin fatherland, and there will be even more who open up beautiful vistas, leading the way to the exaltation of that which is truly ours.

In these remarks I am only trying to place my devotion and good will at the service of our humbler things—those which are illumined with a ray of beauty and which show undeniably our most typical and genuinely national aspect. This short study attempts a synthetic review of the popular artistic development of Guatemala in the realms of textiles and music.

Popular Guatemalan artistic expression, like the Mexican, is essentially decorative; in its every aspect there is a conscious urge toward ornamentation. Popular Guatemalan decoration is characterized by geometric equilibrium and harmony of color line, and attended by an entirely original grace and a good taste. This artistic folk sentiment—inheritance of an artistic people scattered through Mexico and Central America—expresses its being in a most intense form, to prove

which one needs only to look a moment at an *huipil* (woman's blouse) from Totonicapán, or a decorated *jacara* (bowl) from Sacatepequez. The popular art of Guatemala is full of harmonious color and preserves even to the smallest detail the artistic dignity which we inherit from the Mayas.

Although Guatemala is very small, it has, as has Mexico, a great variety of climate and soil conditions, variety of customs, and above all, the multiple ramifications of the primitive Mayan race. Diverse living conditions and different application of the products of their art also have their effect. Guatemala, consisting scarcely of 113,000 square kilometers, relies industrially on the extensive Pacific Coast and on the warm jungles of the Petén and Izabel on the Atlantic—covered with enormous woods filled with mahogany, cedar, ebony, and rubber—prodigal lands in which Nature accumulates her best gifts; the mountain ridge with its extremely low temperatures and imposing scenery offers a very sharp contrast to this tropical exuberance. In these rugged mountains lies Atitlán, a marvelous lake which looks like a stupendous amethyst set in a ring of mountains. In the deep blue waters of this lake are reflected the four volcanoes, San Pedro, Atitlán, Santa Clara and Tohinan. In sharp contrast to the more primitive activities of the lowlands, in all the temperate and colder regions the fantasy of the people has expressed itself in an exuberant combination of embroidered silk and exquisite, patiently wrought wool.

Individual differences between the native tribes themselves are another factor which, even within the textile industry itself, diversifies the popular production. The Mayan groups which reached Guatemala from Yucatán came down the River Motagua to Quiriguá, where beautiful and admirably sculptured archæological pieces are still found, and thence on to Copán; the founders of Palenque and Chaculá, coming south through Chiapas, penetrated to the center of the country, and from there went on to the south. From this southern Mayan group originated the Maya-Quiché nation, which gave rise to the various tribes which inhabit Guatemala today. All these tribes have distinct characteristics and customs, and each has its almost perfect language. The Maya-Quiché tribes belong properly in the center and western parts of the country and are formed by the Quetchies, natives

of the Alta-Verapaz; the Poconchies also came from the Alta-Verapaz and at the present time are greatly intermingled with the former; the properly called Quichés, established in the ancient Quiché kingdom; the Cachiqueles, tribes from the state of Sololá; the Zutuhiles, who inhabit the thirteen villages on the Lake of Atitlán; the Cochi-queles in the states of Escuintla, Chimaltenango, and Sacatepequez, whose language, along with the Quiché, is considered the most perfect of the aboriginal dialects in Guatemala. The Pocomames are indigenes who live in the states of Amatitlán, Guatemala and Jalapa, in the eastern part of the Republic. The Mames are at the present time a very large tribe who extend over the western states of Huehuetenango, Quetzaltenango, Totonicapán, and San Marcos, on the Mexican borderline. There are other tribes of lesser importance, like the Ixiles of the Quiché sierra, the Chijes of Huehuetenango, the Jacaltecos of the neighborhood of Chiapas, and the Pipiles of probable Navan or Nahuan origin, who inhabit the states contiguous to our sister republic Salvador. All the tribes which dwell in the state of El Petén near Yucatán are of pure Mayan origin and are composed of the Lacandones, the Mopanés, and others of lesser importance.

In many regions the indigenous element still keeps itself pure; hence the predominance of the indigenous over every other popular artistic sentiment. All the popular *criollo* (Spanish, born in America) production preserves an excellent standard of traditional indigenous decorative character, æsthetic delineation, grace, and simplicity. If one visits the villages of the sierra, one sees that the flavor of the artistic work is entirely indigenous; the textiles preserve a primitive purity which is charming, both in its decoration and in the manner of wearing. The primitive loom, fastened to the belt, is still in vogue in these regions.

But if we visit the cities or small centers, we find that there has succeeded to the primitive loom another one, no less primitive but more advanced in type: the foot loom. In the cities, especially those in the western part of the high tablelands, weaving, the most important among the popular industrial arts of Guatemala, has reached a period of great activity.

I referred to the variety of forms of popular production in Guatemala; the utilitarian purpose of this production contributes to its

variety. Pottery, textiles, gold and silver work, the making of utensils from wood, willow work, wrought iron work, basketry, fiber textiles, leather work, popular literary and musical expression always show that profound æsthetic sentiment indicative of the highly artistic capacity of the people of Guatemala.

As has happened in Mexico, with its pottery production, so large and well known because it is utilitarian, just so the industry of embroidered textiles in Guatemala has grown immensely, because it is a response to a need; by means of it the entire indigenous population, and part of the *criollo* and *mestizo* (mixed Indian and Spanish) population are dressed.

We might divide the textile industry into two categories: that which is properly indigenous or autochthonous, and that which is *criollo*. The autochthonous industry, as I said before, the most extensive, the richest, and the most beautiful, is that which has given to the production of the country its most individual characteristic. If it is a certain conclusion that modern machinery is to strip those industries of their true flavor and worth, just so is it sure that the spirit which animates the textile industry of Guatemala is intimately linked to the soul of the people; and even if its means of expression vary, its results will always be satisfactory. To love our own things does not necessarily mean to throw a wrench into the wheels of progress; there may come a day when facility of production will change the individual flavor of this industry which is so peculiarly our own. Naturally we do not wish our indigenous peoples to become conglomerations of men laboring for the recreation of curious tourists—as has happened in New Mexico—but groups of men conscious of their capacity to evolve their possibilities for their own benefit and that of others. If we try to preserve this state of artistic production, we ought only to give direction to its activities, keeping constantly in mind its individualities and tendencies. Our people are essentially artists, and in consequence we ought to collaborate to keep the sacred fire burning, estimating absolutely and justly that which they produce; a piece of embroidered cloth ought not to be estimated according to its value in the metal which it brings, but according to the sum of the excellencies which have produced it. Our efforts then ought to have as their aim the raising of our artistry to its highest

level, and not only to raise it, but to create an evaluation based on quality of work.

The indigenous textile art is without doubt the most beautiful, but that of the *criollos* has the importance of volume of production, since its field of activity is not limited merely to clothing, but to articles which fulfill more general functions, with a major tendency toward applied decoration. This widening of the field of *criollo* textiles has not taken away the beauty of the product nor caused it to lose its charm, a new reason for affirming the interrelationship between the soul of the people and its means of expression.

The textile industry in Guatemala negates the theory of Dr. Atl, who is well versed in matters pertaining to folklore; his thesis is that those who live in the warm regions of Mexico and Guatemala are the decorators par excellence. In Guatemala, the marvelous decorators of those fabrics which Tableda, the great poet and discerning chronicler, described as "sparkling like flowers or precious stones and opulent in their shades as birds or butterflies," are those who inhabit the high tablelands and the mountaintops, the admirable weavers of Quetzaltenango, Totonicapán, San Marcos, and La Verapaz. I understand that decorative expression is in direct proportion to the activity of a region; the inhabitants of the warm regions in general are less active than those of the highlands.

The greatest production of textiles is in the western and central parts. In the western districts near Chiapas, Quetzaltenango, Totonicapán, San Marcos, and Huehuetenango, the production of textiles is stupendous; the same is true of the high tablelands of Sacatepequez and of La Verapaz. As the western districts have an enormous indigenous population, the production is vigorous. The native Quetzaltecan woman wears an *huipil*, a blouse with large draperies embroidered all over in silk; this embroidery is generally of harmonious geometric figures or animals done with an individual grace, or flowers worked out with the finest fantasy. This is covered with a *rebozo* or folded shawl, of wool or woven cloth, in dignified and harmonious colors: reds, browns, greens, blues. The skirt, in pleats at the waist and adjusted with a red *faja* (sash), completes the æsthetic ensemble of this very intriguing costume. In Totonicapán the textiles worn by the aborigines are made of embroidered wool and silk; the

Indian of San Cristobal binds her hair with a ribbon of silk exquisitely woven and decorated with geometric designs and strange animals, creations of a rare fantasy. Over the *huipil* they wear a piece of wide embroidery always uniquely embroidered with refined and most graceful motifs. From among these designs there always peeps out a flower which seems part orchid, part butterfly; when the native of Totonicapán uses the dark-hued *huipil* she merely plucks a flower—a crimson dream—which has its exact color counterpart in the ample pleated skirt. In spite of the fact that costumes of these aborigines are in general identical, each production of embroidered cloth shows as to form, a creative personality which makes it different from every other one. "Style is emotion manifesting itself in especial images tinged with the general manner of expression of the particular temperament of the artist," said a poet, a thought which we might apply with complete propriety to the wonderful anonymous weavers of Totonicapán.

I remember with complete and devoted admiration a humble weaver of San Cristobal Totonicapán, José Xicay; he was a simple man; hardly did he take note of what was coming forth from his marvelous hands. This artist sold his creations by the square meter.

All the textile production of this region which is used for costumes—each village of the sierra has its own particular model—is distinguished by the opulence and marvelous harmony of its coloring, by its excellent quality, and by its most gracious designs, creations of an unlimited imagination. The men of these regions wear clothing of black wool with red and blue ornamentation; the costumes of the aborigines of San Martin Chile Verde in Quetzaltenango, are most sumptuous; these enormous natives, as they go back and forth through the fields, present a spectacle which has the majesty of a priestly procession.

In the central regions—provinces of Guatemala, Sacatepequez, Caceres, Old Guatemala, Chimaltenango, Alta and Baja Verapaz—which also have a large proportion of the indigenous element, the textile industry is intensely productive, not only with respect to volume, but also to material and artistic quality. The subtle weavers of Cobaneras and the heavy colorful blankets of Mexico are celebrated. Here it is fitting to mention the royal customs of the aborigines of

Sacatepequez and Chimaltenango, in the center of the country. In Chimaltenango the women wear a large tunic-like blouse, which is embroidered; the hair is bound by a very wide embroidered band, in the manner of a turban; the æsthetic and sumptuous effect is marvelous.

It is impossible, for lack of space, to mention the diverse character of the costumes of the tribes of Guatemala; each village has its original note; a costume woven in La Verapaz does not have the remotest likeness to one of Huehuetenango or Sacatepequez or Chimaltenango; each piece of weaving, each piece of embroidery, each expression bears always the stamp of beauty and originality.

In Momostenango, one of the provinces of Totonicapán, and in Chichicastenango, of the province of Quiché—cradle of Popol-Vuh—the industry of textiles in wool is farthest advanced. The mountain ponchos or *zerapes* are already famous for their quality; they are of most careful workmanship and of beautiful and harmonious coloring. This coloring is always severe, generally sepia with green or yellow designs, or ochre, or carmine with blue or black. This industry has reached a great development in the country because of the low cost and the great preference of the people for these ponchos of grave and harmonious design.

Textile industries which might be called *criollan* are found in centers of some importance—Quetzaltenango, Totonicapán, Sololá, Guatemala, Antigua. These *criollan* textiles do not have an immediate utilitarian end, as do those properly called indigenous, but are made with wider aims—for domestic uses, interior decoration, etc. The weavers of the highlands are legion, and the textiles, as well as the techniques and forms of decoration, are passed down from father to son in such a family, since all are weavers. These weavers make useful articles, like sheets, cloth for aprons, shawls, girdles, tablecloths, napkins, light and airy curtains with which most of the inhabitants of Guatemala decorate their houses. All these weaves are admirably conceived; their designs are harmonious and the colors are well combined. These unknown artists use silk in such a delicate way that it borders on the miraculous.

The textile industry of Guatemala is, to sum up briefly, most important because it is a real manifestation of popular artistry, of

quality, personality, diversity and beauty. The same marvelous hand which sculptured the bas-reliefs of Quiriguá embroiders today the shirts of San Cristobal Totonicapán.

For reasons identical with those given for the textiles, Guatemalan music may be divided into the aboriginal and the *criollan*; fortunately, this last form has preserved many of the characteristics of the first. The native Guatemalan music has a most peculiar quality; its melody is simple, crystalline, and of penetrating spirit. In spite of the natural evolutions which this music has undergone on account of the very strong influences—still operative—brought about by the Conquest; and although one may note certain outward modulations, this music has maintained in its original form the profound musical characteristics of the indigenous soul. The primitive instruments continue to roll out those long and dolorous melodies which are without doubt the soul expression of our monolithic, rectilinear race. The *chirimia* (flageolet) and the *tun* (small drum) as well as the drum of goat's leather, continue to express in the silent countryside, in the remotest villages, in the frenzied and interminable dances of the region, at festivals, the sonorous soul of our people.

Thanks to the work, eminently patriotic and able, of one of our illustrious musicians, the Quetzaltecan teacher Jesús Castillo, who undertook the task of transcribing the music of the infinite number of villages of all Guatemala, we may now study our musical characteristics. Two indigenous dances have already been compiled by the teacher Castillo, *Los Toritos* (The Little Bulls) and *La Conquista* (The Conquest). The first one is a bucolic poem, lively, full of references to the soil. A vivid *allegro* opens the dance, which is the invitation to it by the elders to the young folks. In the theme there are traditional motifs mixed with the Spanish motifs, which have probably been added later. The *Toro* is the central figure. Then follows an *allegro scherzoso* danced by the servant of the *Amo* (master), a younger person, and the *Toro* in a somewhat languid and ceremonious rhythm. A third number, that of the Shepherd, is quite grave, very dignified and liturgical; the accompaniment to the full and sonorous melody by the drum and *tun*, interwoven with the *chirimia* is imposing. Then the Corporal and the Majordomo perform a lively pastoral dance, in *tempo allegro*, almost primitive in its frenzy, in order to

prepare for the entrance of the *Amo*, which is one of the most original and characteristic of our musical expressions. How penetrating is the sound of the *tun*! The notes are crystal clear and are continually interwoven with those of the *chirimia*. O Santos Kolop, marvelous possessor of the secret of the *chirimia*! One by one, in the face of the ecstasy of the absorbed spectators, there come from that primitive instrument drops of blood of a race, transformed into notes. After these solo dances, the *Torito* enters into action and kills the *Amo*; a crowd assembles and they bury him to the tune of a dolorous funeral march, which is without doubt the synthesis of our sorrow. The *allegro* movement returns as if to put far away all sad thoughts, and a vigorous naturalness appears in the general dance, in which all, old and young, mingle in token of a more brotherly and just equality. During the whole dance, which lasts many, many hours, without the least trace of fatigue on the part of the dancers, it may be noted with what wise arrangement, with what intuitional force the pictures follow each other, in perfect accord with the music, in a balance of groups and of individuals who do not fail a single moment to keep themselves in a just and perfect harmony, in the "feel" of the composition.

CARLOS CHÁVEZ, director of the National Conservatory of Music; conductor of the Symphony Orchestra of Mexico; composer of modern indigenous symphonies.

THE MUSIC OF MEXICO

CARLOS CHÁVEZ

THE MUSIC of Mexico is very diverse, quite as much as are the racial, intellectual and social conditions of the Mexicans. By far the best to do with the music of Mexico is to play it, or to hear it. But talking about it has also its interest. Very little has been written or said of the music of Mexico and that little has been about some of its least important aspects. In this lecture, I shall endeavor to make a general summary in more of a critical than an informative manner.

For many reasons, the need of a critical review of the music and the other arts of Mexico is of utmost urgency. A knowledge of our history and of our country will make us really feel ourselves. The greater part of Mexican art has not really become completely Mexican, because Mexican artists have failed to fully saturate themselves in the life of Mexico in all the multiplicity of its expressions. Regionalism really becomes nationalism, when nationalism comes to be in truth the balanced sum of all the regions. The "national style" will be the result of mutual understanding between the many groups of the Mexican people and of the country itself in all its manifestations. In Mexico, not only does an almost complete gulf exist between the people of the country and those of the city, but even within the city itself, there exist countless groups, more or less cultured, that do not know one another.

Tradition, in its best significance, should be considered as the substance of the conscience of a country throughout its past. Thus

considered, tradition is a living fountain of knowledge and of character. There are peoples who have a well-established tradition. The Mexican people is not one of them. It has been impossible here in Mexico to sum up our life because the very factors have been kept apart by a multitude of political causes: The Spanish conquerors triumphed; as rulers in the land, they governed ignoring or denying the culture of the aboriginal element; at the advent of the Republic, the racial, social and intellectual conditions of the Mexicans reached points of contrast violent in their degree of utter diversity and to this day no form of proper coördination can be attained.

A revolutionary political organization established and fearlessly carried out; and a program which, bringing together all of the factors of Mexican culture, synthesizes one tradition, will undoubtedly, in the end, give us nationality. Then we shall have culture and national arts. We talk much of "nationalism." Is this a symptom that Mexico is endeavoring to define her personality in all its varied aspects—in science, in art, in legislation?

The musicians of Mexico must know our tradition, for until such day as they do, our composers will not write Mexican music and they will go on saying that we have to continue in the European tradition and that the Mexican tradition does not exist. Professional musicians will continue their nine-year courses of composition, teaching our youth the rules of French and German conservatories. They will continue making us believe that music *is* Bach or Beethoven. They will go on destroying in our youth all its native force, annihilating all expression of the natural qualities peculiar to this race and to this country. Yet the Mexican painters of today have found the Mexican tradition of painting which the academies prior to the Revolution had denied without knowing.

A Mexican music exists. It is diverse, diverse in history and in the countless regional divisions of the country. But it has a character and vigor of its own. None of it but gives us fully the Mexican musical tradition. We may go directly to this music, in case it is the music played at the present time, or we may become acquainted with it by means of special investigations. The investigation in this case is not one of searching through cold, dead, archæological material in an artificial manner, but rather that of identifying ourselves with the

expressions of our own race, climate and geography from which, for absurd reasons, we had been temporarily disconnected. The ancient culture of Mexico should constitute a common bond among us, that is to say, it should be a factor which integrates our culture. The past, we now know, is as alive as the present, when the present is its natural consequence.

Factually, the music of Mexico may be divided into three great epochs in relation to our general history: I.—The Aboriginal Culture; II.—The *Mestizaje* or phase representing the intermixing of Indian and Spanish; III.—The Nationalism of the Revolution.

The first epoch is known by a group so small as to be counted without difficulty; it is ignored by practically the entire public. But in point of force and originality, this division is perhaps the most important of all.

Among the ancient Mexicans, music was not only an individual expression indispensable to the life of the spirit but a concern of an entire state organization. Institutions for the teaching of music existed and special musical instruction was required in all religious and military schools. The political, social and religious solemnities, as well as the various public celebrations of secular character, always centered around music as a basis.

The sources of information about this early music are the chronicles of the conquerors, the accounts left by some of the ancient Indians who were educated and the works of general history concerning Mexico which are recognized as creditable; the knowledge of music possessed by the contemporary Indians who still, in many regions of the country, preserve the manner of execution and the forms of the most ancient traditions; and the study of the ancient instruments preserved in various museums of the world.

The second epoch is neither well known in its entirety nor in the various phases of its evolution. This epoch may be considered as extending from the Conquest down to the Revolution of 1910. It is rich in the variety of its manifestations, from the country and from the city:

"Mestizo" (mixed Spanish and Indian) music from the country—
Sonnet ("son").
Ballad (corrido).

Song (*canción*).

Dance music—religious and profane.

Romance or pastoral (*pastorela*).

"*Mestizo*" music of the city—

Compositions of the professional composers.

Concert and chamber music.

Dance music.

The third epoch is the present. It may be considered to have begun when, in 1912, Manuel M. Ponce initiated the movement popularizing the Mexican song (*canción Mexicana*) and some of our regional dances such as the *jarabe*. The very great interest which this movement aroused was undoubtedly due to the conviction of its initiator and to the nationalistic restlessness which at that time and as a result of the Revolution of 1910 raged in a manner uncontrollable.

At the present time, with new phases of the Revolution begun in 1910 now lived through and past, leaving their very decisive contribution to the cementing of a criterion and a national culture, the musical nationalism of Mexico may definitely launch itself upon a determined course. It should consider itself as the product of balanced *mestizaje*, hybridism, in that the personal expression of the artist be absorbed neither by Europeanism nor by Mexican regionalism. We must recognize our own tradition, temporarily eclipsed. We should saturate ourselves with it, placing ourselves in personal contact with the manifestations of our land, native and mixed (*mestizos*), and this without disavowing the music of Europe—since it signifies human and universal culture—but receiving it in its multiple manifestations from the most remote antiquity, not through the medium of the "didacticism" of the German and French conservatories as has been our custom heretofore. We deny the *professional Mexican music* prior to our own epoch for it is not the fruit of the true Mexican tradition.

In the end, we musicians must forge ourselves through work; we must make an art that is for all, not enclosed solely within the four walls of the concert hall. We must tend toward the more spectacular performances of music, theater and ballet such as the ancient Mexicans were accustomed to enact, such as Greece had, spectacles which epitomize, which forge into one the soul and the national conscience.

IV

EDUCATION IN MEXICO

RAFAEL RAMÍREZ is head of the Department of Rural Education, Ministry of Public Education of Mexico.

THE FEDERAL PROGRAM OF EDUCATION IN MEXICO

RAFAEL RAMÍREZ

THE Federal Government executes its educational program through two agencies: The National University and the National Department of Education. The University is responsible for higher education. It is autonomous. To the National Department of Education are reserved the primary and secondary aspects of the program. I will limit myself to the program of the National Department of Education.

The federal program of education in Mexico has six divisions:

- I.—Rural Education.
- II.—Town and city primary education.
- III.—Training of teachers and improvement of teachers in service.
- IV.—Secondary education.
- V.—Vocational education.
- VI.—Other complementary services.

With the exception of the Federal District, the Territory of Quintana Roo and of the two Districts, northern and southern, of Baja California, in which the entire educational program and organization is federal, the Department carries on only a partial program and organization in the remainder of the Republic. In the various states the education of the citizenry is a coöperative enterprise in which municipalities, state governments and the Federal Government all take part. Even though in this collaboration the exact limits of participation have not been defined, it may be said in a general way that the Federal Government has functioned in order to round out and to

strengthen the work of states and municipalities. This action has not always been completely coördinated and the endeavors have not always resulted in a harmonious whole. In a country in process of formation, as is ours, in which as yet we have not been able to find the true norms of social coöperation, it is natural that obstacles present themselves and troubles arise at every step. In many cases these troubles have appeared in the form of local jealousy due to lack of comprehension of what was intended—which has hindered the Federal Government from rendering efficient aid. In other cases there has been on the part of the local governments a serious attempt to relieve themselves of educational responsibility in view of the intense activity maintained by the federal organization within its jurisdiction. And almost always, with a few honorable exceptions, the federal organization was regarded as intrusive in spite of the fact that the Constitution of the country establishes full right to promote and encourage education throughout the national domain. Under the circumstances, a considerable part of the thought and action of the National Department of Education has been occupied in winning understanding and favor and in developing coördination. Its strictly educational development or integration would not have progressed so slowly if the way had been free of these obstacles. The way is still not entirely clear. But it soon will be. The present Secretary of Education, Licenciado don Aarón Sáenz, has called a convocation of the governors of the various states and territories, which will be held this August in the National Capital for the purpose of devising ways and means for the coördination of our educational programs.

The Rural Schools.—In Mexico we have about ten million people who live widely scattered over great open country, grouped together only in tiny settlements. For a long time these poor people have had no schools in which to acquire learning. Schools? They had nothing whatever, much less schools! They had not even surnames. They were named Pedro, Juan, Francisco, because their given names were considered more than enough for them. They had hardly any possessions, but they were burdened with obligations. They had to pay heavy taxes; they had to give tithes and first fruits to the church; they had to pay to the master the rent of the ground on which they lived, and all this on the wretched wage of twenty-five to thirty-seven cents a day. Poor

things! They were like the serfs of the eighteenth century under the full sway of absolute monarchy.

There is a Spanish proverb which says that "by dint of beating, the most patient ass will eventually rear up and kick." So it was with these people. By dint of suffering, eventually they revolted. They filled up the battalions of the rebels and made the greatest and most widespread revolution that there has been in the country. At its triumphant end, they found themselves owners of a bit of ground and they saw their school come into being. If they would work and study, now they would have bread for the sustenance of the body and learning for the sustenance of the spirit. For this reason I have always maintained that the rural school is by birth and doctrine an institution of genuine revolutionary origin. Born of the Revolution, it took therefrom its thinking and the Revolution shaped its heart. The school therefore works for the social rehabilitation of the country folk.

In all probability you think that the rural school of Mexico has been created primarily to instruct the children. This is not the case. Wherever a rural school is functioning, it is there to serve the entire community and is considered responsible for the solution of its problems. In general these problems are those of social disorganization, poverty, apathy, discomfort, ignorance, fanaticism, superstition, uncouthness, and, perhaps, of most importance, social injustice. To be sure, the rural school is teaching reading, writing and arithmetic to the children, but this is not its principal function. If it is at all significant in the economy of the national life it is because it plays a more important rôle. In order to integrate with our national development ten million people, the purely scholastic endeavor of the school would have little force. Therefore, when a rural school is established, it takes for its task the reorganization of the whole community, and not just a small part of it. It takes the whole community, I repeat, and begins to teach it, not simply to read and write, but to live a more adequate rural life. In what follows you will see in what a surprising way this comes about. At its advent, the rural school stirs up the people and awakens in them a new community consciousness. It adds to this by integrating mere dwellers into a collective whole that can know and feel its needs, and can be aware of the resources which it has to meet these needs.

The rural school of Mexico is, then, a socializing institution. If you doubt it, go about in rural districts; you will find it everywhere in the country forming community consciousness and organizing the citizenry to work for their own rehabilitation.

The rural school of Mexico is, besides, an agency which operates to perform numerous social services. The introduction and distribution of water for a little settlement, the health and sanitation service of a community, postal service, road-making, the making of playgrounds, the organization of wholesome centers of recreation, and ever so many other services may originate in the school. The school also affords rural dwellers an economic education.

In Mexico we have *Circuitos Rurales* (Rural Circuits). They are groups of small communities, with a larger central community as a nucleus. We have opened in each central community a thoroughly organized rural school with all its equipment and services, and have placed in charge of this school a well-trained teacher, so that the institution may serve as a demonstration center. This type of school is entirely maintained by the Federal government. In the surrounding communities we have also established little schools, but we follow an entirely different method for supporting them. Our supervisors have gone forth to stir up the spirit of the dwellers in these places, creating cultural interests and encouraging real desires for betterment. When the enthusiasm of the people of the place is at the right point, we ask of them a periodic, voluntary contribution toward the salary of the teacher. As the members of the community are those who pay the teachers, we give them a certain participation in their selection, with the condition that they choose from among persons who are honorable, who have completed at least six years of primary education, who understand and like rural life and have, besides, personalities for social leadership. Sometimes it happens that the communities are so poor that the amounts collected are not sufficient to pay the teachers. The Federal organization then is willing to make up the deficit. We have agreed to call the system of schools formed in this way *Circuito Escolar* (school circuit).

We now have 2,438 schools of this type, grouped in 703 circuits. About 109,000 children have been registered in them and an average

of 97,000 attend for daily instruction. The attendance of adults, men and women, is around 48,000.

And note especially what follows. I have spoken only of the fact that it is the communities themselves that pay the teachers. I wish to add, now, that the communities themselves also build the schools and provide them with furniture and supplies, and give land necessary for establishing the school and its annexes and for agricultural activities. And as everything which the dwellers in the settlements do implies great privation and sacrifice for them, they are watchful that their children attend school in order to reap full benefit.

Indian Schools.—In the region of the Tarahumara Indians of Chihuahua, the Chamulas at Chiapas and in the National Capital the Department of Education has organized Indian schools. There are only four, and the most important of them is the one in the Capital. They are educational centers planned for the purpose of having the Indian young men constantly under the influence of the teachers. They are all very well as centers for the purpose of individual cultural development, but the method is very expensive. Then why have we created them? They have been established by way of experiment. The one in this capital in particular has been established with the idea of demonstrating to the incredulous that the indigenous stock is capable of redeeming itself. A short time ago, on the occasion of the anniversary of the founding of *La Casa del Estudiante Indígena* in this city, I heard in the festival which was held, in an address of General Calles, these eloquent words: "I organized and founded this educational institution for Indian people for the purpose of demonstrating in an evident manner to the bourgeoisie and the wealthy of the country and especially to those of the City of Mexico that our native stock, exploited, mocked and scoffed at heretofore, has sufficient capacity to redeem itself by means of education. These young men whom you see here were pulled up by the roots, as it were, from the mountains and brought to the city like creatures of the virgin forest to be domesticated. Behold them, now, civilized, and tell me: What difference do you find between these young men and the sons of the wealthy who parade along the Calle de Plateros in elegant automobiles? I sincerely believe there is none, but in case there is, it would be in favor of these educated Indians."

Thus said General Calles and in so saying he uttered a great truth. And because this is a very great truth the Federal government has faced the problem of the education of the Indian people. It will not do it on a large scale with Indian schools because they are too costly; but it will redeem the Indian people of their backwardness by means of the numerous rural schools. We will go on with utter devotion founding rural schools in regions inhabited by the native stock and within a decade of persistent effort, Mexico, without losing its racial characteristics, will be a different country.

Primary Education of the Town and City Type.—In the city of Mexico and the Federal District, in the Territories of Baja California and Quintana Roo, in the principal frontier cities, in the state capitals and in many of the population centers of clearly urban type the Federal government sustains 657 primary schools of a corresponding nature. The daytime is devoted to instruction of the children and the evening to adult education. If to the pure scholastic work just mentioned we add social gatherings which they organize, occasional festivals and social betterment campaigns which they carry on, the picture of their organization is fairly complete. There is nothing extraordinary in what they are doing; they are like primary schools the world over. They are just ordinary schools, schools which have not the least characteristic which marks them and singles them out from the common run. Just as they are, and in the state in which they are, they do not inspire in me great fondness. I would wish them more restless, not with such a tame and tranquil spirit; I would be glad to see them more aggressive and not so passive and so resigned to a situation which offers resistance to transformation. What a difference there is between these schools and the rural schools of which I spoke.

Training of Teachers and the Improvement of Those in Service.—For the training of teachers for the urban type of school, the Department of Education maintains in the Capital a National Teachers College. The young people who are attracted to the teaching profession receive in this institution a sound academic preparation and a careful professional training. Year after year come forth from this

school a goodly number of teachers with a clearer vision of what the primary school of urban type should be. On these young teachers we base our hope for an educational revival by virtue of which these schools will get free of the iron band with which tradition and routine have bound them.

For the preparation of teachers for schools in the mountains and fields there are scattered throughout the country fifteen regional normal schools. They carry on remarkable work. Within two or three days we will visit the one which functions in Oaxtepec. You will then get an idea of the important work which these modest institutions are performing. They provide the students with the needed academic and vocational knowledge; they teach them rural industries and crafts; they train them in the work which they are to carry on later in the communities; they give many opportunities for sports and games; they teach them how to bring recreation into the life of a community; they forge in them a temperament for social leadership and devotedly deposit in their hearts the seed of an immense affection for the country people and a great longing for their redemption. Many young graduates of these regional normal schools are doing excellent work as teachers in the rural schools.

A large proportion of the teachers in service in the rural schools were, so to speak, recruited on a venture. We chose them from among persons of good will, who knew how to read and write, who had manifest aptitude for teaching, who had a love for our country people. The choices have been almost always well made, for all have been guided by a remarkable purpose. But we could not leave them without further training. It was necessary to do something to enlarge and enrich their knowledge and improve them vocationally. Then it was that we thought of the *Misiones Culturales*. A *Cultural Mission* might be explained by saying that it is a sort of faculty of a normal school which travels about the country, remaining in specified districts for four weeks at a time to give intensive courses to the teachers who have been called together. We call these courses institutes. We try to enlarge the general knowledge of the teachers and to impart to them instruction and advice intended to give them ever better techniques. They are trained in agricultural activities and in small industries and rural crafts; and, taking advantage of the community in which the

Institute is held, they are shown how to work for the economic, social and spiritual betterment of the community. In these institutes the teachers learn something also of vocal and instrumental music, something of plastic arts, especially drawing, painting, wood and stone carving, and something of the rural manual arts.

The members of a cultural mission are:

A chief, the director of the "Mission" who has charge of organizing and directing the work, and the cultural and vocational improvement of the teachers;

A social worker whose part is that of the betterment of health and home-life;

A physical education teacher for calisthenics, sports, games and various forms of community recreation;

A teacher for music and folk songs, who at the same time that he teaches gathers up bit by bit our wealth of folklore scattered and lost among the fields;

A teacher of agriculture and animal husbandry; and

A teacher of small industries and rural crafts.

A "Mission" does not work exclusively with the teachers in the various institutes; the entire community is taken into the work which is carried on by the *Misioneros*. By a thousand ways and means they enter into the life of the community and organize it for the task of its own betterment.

Twelve of these "Missions" are going throughout the country. Would that they were as many as the states which form the Republic. The work which they perform is so important that not only the teachers recruited on a venture take advantage of them, but even the teachers graduated from the Normal Schools. The *Misiones Culturales* revive spiritual searching in them, stir them up and try to keep them abreast of the times and in this way promote the progress of our schools.

The Problem of Secondary Education.—There has not been a federal system of secondary schools in Mexico. The only institution of this nature which has been maintained by the Department of Education was in the national Capital. Its capacity was insufficient for the

whole school population which desired to add to their primary school preparation and fit themselves for university and professional careers. Three years ago the Department faced the problem and studied the reorganization of schools. It was absolutely necessary to establish more schools, but it was also necessary to plan for them a new organization which would respond to the demands for the present-day life of Mexico and the aspirations for more adequate culture which the people in urban centers of population are beginning to feel. There were established 8 schools: 4 for boys, 3 for girls, and an evening school to the end that the very poorest people who have to earn a daily living by manual toil may have an opportunity to rise to higher levels of culture. But at the same time that the number of schools was increased, an effort was made to define their mission, to better their organization and to study thoroughly their content and meaning; that is to say, the schools were made over with a new point of view. They are now "set up," as you say, upon well defined and valid principles of secondary education. I know that there are those in Mexico who criticize and censure them. But one who does so neither knows nor understands them, and wishes to see them constituted in the old-fashioned way, with the classical humanities as their sole content. Those of the present time place emphasis on the study of what one of you has called so rightly "modern humanities," the sciences, applied sciences above all.

The secondary schools of Mexico provide only three years of study. In our terminology we call this period *primer ciclo de enseñanza secundaria* (the first cycle of secondary instruction). For the second cycle the students pass to the National Preparatory School, which belongs to the University.

As you see, the system of secondary schools is still small because it has just been born. Some day it will be large and strong, and will come of age. In spite of its size, the federal system of secondary education is already a source of influence and inspiration. The secondary schools which state governments maintain in the country have adopted its thinking, its programs, its organization and its methods of work. We are pleased with the tiny system and are going to look after it carefully.

The Problem of Vocational Education.—The Mexican Revolution has clearly entered upon a constructive period. Before long even the most tumultuous passions will have been calmed. We will have complete peace in the country; men of affairs, both citizens of the country and foreigners, assured of finding sufficient guarantees for making investments, will begin to develop in the country a more ample economic life. We need to prepare the new generation for this new era, which we believe is drawing near; and we have thought of nothing better than creating vocational schools which “put into the hands of youth a useful instrument for producing and not a talisman for opening the doors of bureaucratic careers.” Our national culture will soon have its own peculiar economic aspects. The great unexploited resources of this country, the unmistakable capacity for work and the intelligence of its inhabitants augur a truly bright agricultural, industrial and commercial future. We should prepare ourselves; for the man who knows how to lay hold of the plow to cleave a furrow in the hard earth and deposit within it the seed; the man who knows how to shape with the hammer on the anvil the share for this same plow; the man who knows how to make ready for us on the loom of the factory the cloth from which our clothing is to be made; the man who, down in the mine, knows how to bring forth from the bowels of the earth its hidden treasures; the man who converts every village into a producing center whose products are distributed far and wide; the man who makes a road; the man who lays a railway; each and every one, in short, who thinks out something with his own mind and does something with his own hands, will share in the triumph of the new era which awaits Mexico.

For this reason, the Federal government, through the Department of Agriculture, is creating gradually throughout the country agricultural schools, calmly announcing that it will not rest for one moment until there is one of these schools in every state in the Republic. Eight of these schools, built and completely equipped, have been installed. Those of you who expect to go to Actopan should take a side trip to *Il Mexe*, an old *hacienda* in the State of Hidalgo, today converted into one of these splendid schools. And in addition to these schools which impart agricultural instruction of a primarily practical nature, the Department of Agriculture maintains in Chapingo an

agricultural school of higher type from which are coming our agricultural specialists.

And because of the necessity which has been felt for preparing our youth for the economic future which awaits the nation, the Department of Education is making a special effort to promote vocational education not only in the national capital but in the country at large by means of both day and evening classes. At present the Department of Education maintains twenty vocational schools for women and five for men. Two commercial schools are also maintained by the Federal organization. We need a greater number, and we need them to be better organized and more intelligently administered. The Secretary of Education has set his hand to this task also and will not let go until the vocational education of our youth shall be definitely assured and founded.

In the Department of Education there is a bureau whose task it is to encourage physical education, especially sports and games. Its work is as yet confined to the bounds of the Federal District. All of us educators know that we need strong, healthy generations the better to serve our country. But, withal, we have not been able to have specialists in physical education to stimulate, promote and direct these activities in our rural environment. The rural teachers do what they can in this respect: they fix up ball fields and playgrounds, form athletic clubs and teams, and arrange exhibitions and athletics, teach exercises and drills and games of strength and skill, all with the intention of making the generations of the future strong and healthy. What more could they do?

Likewise in the Department there is a section for the promotion of music, singing, drawing, painting and other activities of an æsthetic nature. Because of lack of resources its program does not extend beyond the Federal District. Nevertheless in our rural districts all these activities exist in a remarkable degree. All our country people, all our people of native stock, have the souls of artists. They only need some one who has real fondness for them to encourage and stimulate them. And the rural teacher is there to do that. No one has told him how, but he does it with sure and surprising intuition. He does not have a hard time, for as I have just said, in our rural environment every one is an artist. Right now in one of the salons of the ground

floor of the Department of Education Building is a beautiful exposition of folk art. Everything which is exhibited there is the work of either *rancheros mestizos* (the people of mixed blood in the ranch settlements) or people of pure native stock. Nature and their own insight have been their teachers. To our foreign visitors we show with pride the folk arts with which these people earn a livelihood. And, once more, it is the rural teachers who, themselves good rustic artists, with clean, pure feeling, orientate, stimulate and promote in the little settlements in which they work these high and beautiful expressions of life. And what I have just said with respect to the folk arts may be said with respect to the music of the people. It seems as if in our country the purest and most beautiful feeling has fled from the cities to take refuge among the simple, rustic people of the fields and the mountains. And believe me, the rural teachers without any one's telling them, guided only by their own wonderful æsthetic instinct, take care that these beautiful spiritual manifestations of our race do not die out.

Rural Improvement Missions.—There are two *misiones* for rural betterment. One operates in the region of Paracho, Michoacán, and the other in that of Actopan, Hidalgo, two hours and a half from this city on the Laredo highway. I know the work of this "mission" and I consider it remarkable. A group of people of loving and devoted spirit makes up the "mission." Their field of action comprises a desperately dry and sterile region of cactus patches and maguey fields. The people with whom they work are of the Otomi race, in the most lamentable state of backwardness, who understand and speak but little of the Spanish language. Their poverty is extreme; they go about almost naked; they are ill nourished, and most of the time they are sodden with pulque. Their huts are completely primitive; they have not the slightest idea of hygiene and their social structure is nil. They are the spectres of a one-time vigorous race which roamed the forest of the central part of the country. For three hundred years they have made no progress whatever.

This then is the territory in which this "mission" operates, and the human material which it is trying to modify. It will do it. All the members of this "mission" have a real Franciscan spirit; all have the

Christian temperament and the compassion of the early friars who came to this country to succor the native people of the land. This "mission" toils there for the dignifying of the homes, for the creation of a social structure, for the introduction of new forms of activity and the betterment of those already found in the communities to the end of greater economic advantage. It is trying to bring this utterly backward race into the current of our cultural movement. And with what simplicity of spirit they are doing these things which are of such deep and transcendent meaning for us! The visible results of their toil are appreciable to those who, knowing the former situation of the people of this region, have seen it recently in its present situation. Visit the region of Actopan and spend a day or two, watching attentively these "Franciscan missionaries" civilizing the Otomi Indians in their own little communities. If you will do that, you will surely develop a live feeling of affection for this country as it works in honest endeavor to bring down from on high, blessings and happiness from above that all men may share therein.

PEDRO DE ALBA, lawyer and educator; director of the National Preparatory School.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN MEXICO

PEDRO DE ALBA

I SHALL endeavor to bring to you an historical synopsis of the University of Mexico. We Mexicans have to revert to the historical point of view, inasmuch as Mexico represents in America the country with the greatest and longest history back of it.

The 16th century in Mexico was the century of the great viceroys, of the missionaries, of the spiritual forerunners of the western culture as they entered into this Indian world. After the spiritual missionaries and men of apostolic spirit like Las Casas founded in those days what corresponds to the primary schools, the rural schools, and the vocational schools of Mexico, there arose the need for the founding of a superior center of culture, and so it was upon the request of Mendoza that in the middle of the 16th century, by the royal act of Charles V, the Royal and Pontifical University of Mexico was founded. So it was that this university was one of the first to be founded in America, and especially since the days of the Revolution it has endeavored to be integral in its spirit. We of the University of the present time are endeavoring to find the real mission of this University. We do not look askance upon its historical background, but we are endeavoring to find in the days of the colonial period the germ for the function of the University at the present time. As I am desirous of speaking to you upon the question of the Mexican University in the contemporary epoch, I shall be brief in the historical sketch.

From the time of its foundation to the period of the independence of the country, the National University lived through an interrupted period. The organization and function of the University in its early period did not differ from those of other universities. It was filled with theory, scholasticism, and theology, and it fell into a period of routine, especially after it lost the momentum of its founders. In the 17th century when Mendoza, who later became the archbishop, was viceroy of Mexico, he made a report on the University, mentioning that he had found more doctors than classes. This state of affairs continued until toward the end of the 18th century, when a great stimulation was given to the University by the Spanish monarch, Charles III, who endeavored to bring to it the new currents of science and philosophy to be found in the universities of Europe. It was then that the School of Beaux Arts was founded in the University, still carrying the name of Academia de San Carlos. It was then that this beautiful edifice which houses the Seminar was built, through the generosity of many of the teachers in the University. Here is to be found under these very vaults the legacy of the University of those days to the present University.

After the independence the University was not in favor. It was fought all the way because it was considered the last standing-ground of the royalist ideas, the reactionary ideas that were counter to the feeling of independence of those days. So it was that during one of the good governments that Mexico had soon after its independence period, the abolition of the University was decreed, and the foundation of a new institution, which would promote the sciences, was provided for, inasmuch as it was felt that the University was nothing but the cradle of the teachings of the scholastic, theological, dogmatic ideas of the old régime.

In 1833, then, schools were founded which promoted the study of the sciences. It is from this period that we have the foundation of the present School of Medicine. However, there were other schools, especially those that promoted the study of the physical and mathematical sciences, and the required for entrance preparatory subjects such as the study of the indigenous languages, such as the Tarascan, and Otomi. From this time the University was at the mercy of the political factions. The radical, advanced groups of that time fought the University, whereas the conservative groups supported it. It was then that the fruits and results of the University were at low ebb because it was at the mercy of these political groups. One of the proofs that Emperor Maximilian was more closely allied with the liberal elements than with the conservative elements was the fact that during this period there was again the desire to abolish the University because it was too closely connected with the conservatives and reactionaries.

After the triumph of the Republic and the imposing of liberal ideas, as exemplified by Juárez, the University was left somewhat in peace, inasmuch as the desire of the men of that period was to liberate Mexico from one of its greatest yokes, which was considered the being in the hands of the clergy of that time. And so it was that the National Preparatory School was founded. This Preparatory School became, in fact, the seat of the new University, not so far as the arts and sciences were concerned, but rather with respect to the new spirit of the Revolution and the integration of the nation. Then during the period of the presidencies of Juárez, Gonzáles and Díaz there came a sort of eclipse of the University. It was toward the end of the period of General Díaz in 1910, when promoted by the then Secretary of

Public Education in Mexico, Justo Sierra, that the University was integrated once more. It was not so much a restoration of the University or the founding of the University as it was its resurrection, with the purpose of unifying its studies, its organization, and providing a center of culture and scientific investigation, with institutes for such research.

Since that time there has been a most important step in the history of the University. Through a revolutionary student movement it obtained one of its greatest conquests, becoming autonomous, laying the foundation for a cultural center devoted to the highest arts and sciences, entirely independent of the political movements which are so numerous in our country and which might interfere with the high purposes for which it was founded. The real motive for this conquest is historic rather than moral. I have already mentioned the many difficulties that the University had during the early days of the independence in Mexico and how it was at the mercy of the political parties. Today, being autonomous, it is entirely independent of any political movement. It supports itself through a subsidy from the Federal Government, but the Federal Government allows it absolute freedom so far as its functioning is concerned.

Today the University of Mexico has in the neighborhood of 10,000 students, who are distributed throughout the various colleges and schools of which it is composed. There are the School of Painting and Sculpture, the School of Jurisprudence, known as the School of Philosophy and Letters, the School of Medicine, the School of Dentistry, the School of Chemistry, etc., and the Preparatory School, which prepares the students very definitely for the University. There are also the Teachers College, a Primary School, and now there is a project for the founding of a secondary school for the purposes of experimentation. The University also has institutes for special research, such as the Geological Institute, the Biological Institute, the National Observatory, the National Library, and in all probability it will obtain the school now founded in Chapingo for the study of and experimentation in higher agriculture.

During the year which has passed since the University became autonomous, in which the government is shared alike by students and teachers, we have found that it has brought together the two classes,

the student class and the teachers. We have had no disagreeable incidents of any consequence during that period and we believe that once the infancy of this new type of government is passed the University will prove that having been made autonomous by the Revolutionary Government of Mexico was one of the greatest blessings for culture.

In conclusion, I wish to express the sincere hope on the part of the university class in Mexico that it may find in the university groups of the United States that sympathy and understanding with its problems which it seeks, not only of the United States, but of the world at large. It feels that these university groups in any country are called upon to look upon the real problems of the country in a tranquil and serene light, somewhat apart from the political, selfish conditions which they find in private life or in the life of business, and which mean so much for the progress and the advancement of those higher principles which these university groups are trying to make real.

EFRAIN BRITO ROSADO, student in the School of Law of the National University of Mexico; president of the Federation of Students.

THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE STUDENT

EFRAIN BRITO ROSADO

In presenting to you this point of view I shall endeavor to express to you frankly and sincerely the sentiments of the students in Mexico. Inasmuch as we students are not filled with prejudice or do not usually consider expediency, I shall endeavor to place before you the real motives in our activities, inasmuch as I have been a member of this revolutionary group to which Professor de Alba has just referred. I

also wish to say that although I consider myself a Mexican, a Mexican in all ways, nevertheless I have a great deal of sympathy for the people of the United States. Last year I made a tour through the university centers in your country, covering twelve states, and I learned that a great many of our prejudices are erroneous, and I learned further to sympathize extremely with the people of the United States, this sympathy becoming almost love. I also wish to say that in presenting our point of view I do it frankly, and I would like to have the people of the United States come to Mexico as I went to the United States to see the good and great things of our country, and not to look too closely at the bad things. Countries are like men; they have a good side and a bad side.

After the Student Revolution of May, 1929, of which I was a part, there developed two distinct ideals on the part of the student world and toward them we directed all our energies. The first ideal was that the university might not risk its distinct characteristic as a center of intellect and higher culture. We also wish that it might not be made a center for retrogrades. We want the intellectuals in the university, with all their science and all their research, to turn their knowledge to the good of the people. It is beyond our efforts to try to lower the university to the level of the people, but we do wish with much affection, with love and sympathy, to put at the service of the humblest people of this country the knowledge and the truth that may be found in the University of Mexico.

We wish that the second ideal might be that all of the orientation and all of the direction of our culture and research may be intensely rationalistic, that we might go forward along our own road and develop that culture which might be called distinctly our own. We not only have this ideal because of our intense love for Mexico, but because we feel it is rooted in the principles of psychology. The desires, the wishes of a people can only be brought about through the higher culture which may be developed through these desires of the people. We might not be able to do with the spirit that which has been done with the body. With the body we might be able to import the dress from foreign lands, but with the spirit it must of necessity be the result of the intense desires of its own people.

One of the things which I admired most in the United States was

its remarkable adaptation of the principles of culture for its own benefit. I remember reading in Pennsylvania an article by a distinguished author, in which he asked the question, "What is better for the United States, the European culture or the American culture?" He answers that the American culture was of greater value. Unquestionably it is so, because that culture which is created by the people themselves will be of the greatest benefit.

I wish to bring out a point suggested to me by the Superintendent of Education of that great State of Pennsylvania, in which he told me that the American people thought much of the relics of the churches and missions in California and in many states in the southern part of the country, considering them treasures of art and culture from the early days on this continent. In the same way I wish it might be possible for them to appreciate the relics that have been handed down to us and that we might be able to enlist their help and aid in the development of this culture that has been bequeathed to us, this culture of the Indo-Latin nations of America. I wish that the American people might be able to understand Mexico in the light that we understand Mexico. We feel that Mexico today is one of the most peculiar countries of the world because of its deep racial problems and other problems. Inasmuch as we are trying to solve these problems in the light of our knowledge, we wish that you might consider Mexico in the light of other countries that have faced and at least partially solved these problems. Similar problems have been faced by such countries as Greece, France and Spain, and were faced by your country during its independence period. We will try to solve them and to find the best method of going forward in the progress of nations.

In order to demonstrate to you the affection we have for the university groups in the United States, I wish to bring to your attention the fact that the student groups in Mexico have contributed funds and have brought from the University of Texas two students, a boy and a girl, in order that they might look into our life and into our culture and go back to their country and tell the people there the truth in this respect.

The students of Mexico wish also that you might be able to convert yourselves into defenders of an ideal and a culture that is uppermost in our arts, even over and above the economic laws that at the

present time are functioning in our midst. Because of these economic laws it might be that a whole culture and the whole ideal of an Indo-Latin race might be swept away. As you go back to your country we wish it might be possible for you to turn yourselves into defenders of this ideal and this culture for which we are battling.

In conclusion, I wish that it might be possible for you to return to your country, spokesmen for the ideals of Mexico, for the ideals of the youth of Mexico. In my visit to the United States I admired the youth of the country, who might be described in their many activities by one word, "will-power." If I should endeavor to describe in one word the youth of Mexico I might say, "feeling." In working out these ideals we will not fail to keep uppermost in our minds our great heroes: in the north, Washington; in the south, Bolivar.

V

RELIGIOUS FORCES

THE REVEREND DR. MIGUEL DARÍO MIRANDA was spokesman for the Archbishop of Mexico, Exmo. Monseñor Pascual Díaz.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

REV. DR. MIGUEL DARÍO MIRANDA

For one who goes over the pages of our history without any prejudice, and contemplates the means by which this country has attained its own development as a nation, up to the present time, it will be necessary to admit that the most powerful moral force which has influenced its activities during the four centuries of Mexican life, is the Catholic Church; as at every moment one has to acknowledge the influence that either directly or indirectly the Church exercised in every step of the social life, and how beneficial this influence has been for Mexico.

Too much has been written and said against the Catholic Church of Mexico, particularly during the last century, and in a very special way, during these last years. It is not my purpose to answer here to all such writings and statements. This lecture is not a controversy. My purpose is only to make a brief exposition of some general aspects of the Catholic Church influence, in the development of my country. I wish to add that I have here no official representation of the Catholic Church, I am bringing only my individual coöperation to the aims of the Fifth Seminar in its task of studying my country.

In order to give a general outline of the present exposition I wish to say something of what the Church has done in the past and will be able to do in the future, for the prosperous development of Mexico.

NATURE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH INFLUENCE

Before presenting to you the influence of the Catholic Church in my country, I wish to make clear the nature of said influence.

The Catholic Church founded by our Lord Jesus Christ, seeks, as her main object, the eternal happiness of men in heaven. She is therefore a supernatural institution whose aims and means are supernatural too.

Our Lord Jesus Christ said to the Apostles: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." The preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the Sacraments, and the spiritual government of conscience, are the essential, and consequently, the most important means used by the Catholic Church.

It is obvious to say that with such means, during twenty centuries, the Catholic Church has influenced every nation in accordance with her divine mission, trying to extend the knowledge and practice of the Christian doctrine among all nations without distinction of race or language.

We must realize that the Catholic Church's influence is of a spiritual nature; because it acts upon the intellectual and moral faculties of men; and enlightening the thought it promotes human activity, in accordance with the principles and precepts of our Savior Jesus Christ.

Although the supernatural mission of the Church aims to procure the perfect happiness of men in heaven, nevertheless, in regard to the temporal things, she is a source of benefits "as manifold and great as if the chief end of her existence were to ensure the prosperity of our earthly life" (Leo XIII).

This is the reason why history has attributed everywhere to the Catholic Church a very intense participation in promoting civilization in the Western World, before the new one was discovered; and this is logical, because, when the Catholic Church aims to Christianize the individual, she Christianizes also the family, society and all human institutions, which are primarily directed to the earthly happiness of man.

The Catholic Church is not a natural society; it is neither a political institution nor an economic one. The Catholic Church is a religious institution, and her influence is a religious influence, although its effects are of social bearing.

EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY

From the arrival of the first Franciscan missionaries in this country in 1523, on to our days, the Catholic Church has never stopped preaching the Gospel among the Mexican people; and for four centuries, she has left everywhere the signs of her preaching, in the religious monuments scattered all over the country, many of which, by their magnificence and rich artistic value, testify the greater or minor flowering of her efforts in spreading the Gospel. The bearing of her evangelization may be valued by the following high statistical figures:

According to statistical data of 1910 the total population of the Mexican Republic was 15,160,369 inhabitants, of whom 15,033,176 were Catholics; or 99.16%. As per the statistical data of 1921 the total population was 14,334,780 inhabitants, of whom 13,921,226 were Catholics; or 97.12%. We have no available statistical figures of the last census.

He who bears in mind the religious conditions of Mexico, before the evangelization carried on by the Catholic Church; who contemplates the variety of false superstitions and cruel religions, as were those which constituted the patrimony of the different tribes and kingdoms, within the land of Anahuac, and admires today, everywhere, the beautiful shrines and religious ceremonies common to all Mexicans over the republic, in spite of the vast extension of our territory, and the meager means of communication; he who recollects the many different languages and dialects spoken by the Indians, and observes today the predominance of the Spanish language for religious purposes, will have to admit the gigantic effort made by the Church in favor of the diffusion of the Gospel in Mexico. Undoubtedly within such large figures, we must recognize the differences inside the religious group that are the result of differences of education and culture existing among us. But this does not lessen the value of the efforts of the Church in this respect, especially if we consider that the religious development of Mexico reached the highest point during the 18th century, when the means of communication were very scarce and difficult, when the territorial extension was twice as big as it is today, and the number of priests not over 6,000. The merit of such

effort appears greater still if we bear in mind that in 1810 the total population of Mexico was six million, one hundred and twenty-two thousand, three hundred and fifty-four inhabitants, and is now twice as large, and that the Church, for over a hundred years, has been encountering every day, more and greater difficulties in the fulfillment of her mission.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

Our Lord Jesus Christ said to His Apostles: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*" In fulfilling this supreme order, the Church has not only preached the Gospel and promoted divine worship, but she has also exercised her mission of bringing education to the people in accordance with our Lord's doctrine. This is why the action of the missionaries was not limited to the teaching of the Christian doctrine, but in the courtyard of every church a school was established wherein the missionaries instructed the Indians, and promoted their education in an integral way, that is to say, teaching them to live honest and useful lives for themselves, for their families and for the social group.

It is very interesting to note the ingenious means which the missionaries employed in promoting the education of the Indians. The Franciscan missionaries used for their religious and civic instruction to the crowds, especial performances, the so-called Spanish *pastourels*, which are dialogues of various kinds with either religious, historical or moral motives. Fray Pedro de Gante initiated this kind of educational means, gathering crowds of from eight hundred to one thousand Indians with the object of teaching them the Christian doctrine.

These meetings were called "DOCTRINAS," but they were real schools where the Indians were taught how to read and write and other subjects as music, etc. At that time the missionaries established several schools of arts and crafts for the Indian boys.

The efforts made by the Church in favor of education, which she has continuously tried to bring to the people, involved the idea of an

integral education which was at the same time religious, moral, intellectual, social, economic and civic, as proven by the various procedures she has followed.

This education was perfected while the different schools were established in view of educating the *mestizos*, the Indians and the *creoles*. The efforts made by the Church in the line of education had the privilege of bringing to Mexico the first printing press which was brought by Fray Juan de Zumárraga, and of printing the first book in the New World in 1536.

The religious orders in Mexico, especially the Jesuits, the Franciscans, the Augustinians and the Dominicans, took upon themselves the education of the people, and of the higher classes of society, by means of numerous and very important schools; their wonderful buildings still in existence, and which you have probably visited, are a silent proof and an eloquent testimony to the enormous efforts made by the Church during the colonial period, in behalf of the culture of this country.

Another asset to the credit of the Catholic Church along the cultural line, is certainly the foundation of the University of Mexico in 1551, almost one hundred years before Harvard University was established in the United States.

The testimony of Baron von Humboldt, who visited Mexico at the beginning of the 19th century, is of great value. He says: "There is no city in the New Continent, including those of the United States, which exhibits so varied and solid scientific buildings as the City of Mexico."

The educational movement in Mexico suffered a great hindrance with the expelling of the Jesuits from New Spain, by Charles III in 1767, and with their expelling, as stated by the historian Pereyra: "THE CIVILIZATION MADE A RETROGRESSIVE MOVEMENT" (vol. 3, p. 264). It is not my purpose to recount all efforts made by the Church in favor of education in Mexico. The subject is vast and deserves an attentive and objective investigation.

Although the Church has suffered very much during the last century, among so much uncertainty, notwithstanding her increasing impoverishment, and many unfavorable circumstances, the Church made big efforts toward education by means of her parochial schools

and of her colleges, many of which have been conducted by some religious orders of universally recognized competence in the educational field.

It is entirely evident, by the figures previously mentioned of the number of Catholics in Mexico, that the educational work of the Church by means of the schools, played a very important part, as the school is one of the most effective means for evangelization.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The Catholic Church, true to her mission, has been interested in the various social problems, which for the past several years have been a serious preoccupation of the nation. The efforts made by the Church in behalf of the solution of such problems, prove her sincere sympathy towards them. I beg to call your attention to the date of the following activities.

The first Catholic Mexican Convention was held in Puebla from February 20th to March 1st, 1903 (*Imprenta de las Escuelas Salesianas de Artes y Oficios, Puebla, 1903*). In this convention Dr. Miguel Palomar y Vizcarra, delegate from Jalisco, entered a motion creating the "Raiffeissen Banks" (this was the first effort made in this country to that effect), and during the fifth session of this same convention "The Circles for Workingmen" (*Círculos de Obreros*) were discussed, and during the eleventh session the "Indian Problem" was treated as well as the creation of an Arts and Crafts School. In nineteen hundred and four the second Catholic Congress was held in Morelia. The minutes published the same year show that the labor problem was treated more at length.

In nineteen hundred and six the third National Catholic Convention of Mexico was held in Guadalajara, and its minutes published in 1908 (*Tipografía y Encuadernación de El Regional, Guadalajara, 1908*). Most of the meetings and twenty-nine papers were devoted to the discussion of works and activities of social character.

In nineteen hundred and nine, the fourth Catholic Convention was held in the city of Oaxaca (*Imprenta de la "Voz de la Verdad," Oaxaca, 1909*), and the topics for discussion were all regarding "the Indian problem."

In March, 1913, the National Catholic Party held in Guadalajara the "Gran Jornada Social de las Vanguardias." The Social Convention of the Vanguardists studied interesting topics such as the following: "The large estates and their evils," "The Raiffeisen Banks," "The family patrimony," "The Study Clubs," etc.; this program shows that not only the Church, but Catholics anticipated the discussion of the real needs of the epoch.

The Catholic representatives to the Congress of the Union in 1912, members of the "Study Club Leo XIII," initiated the laws regarding the juridical personality of the labor unions; the laws to regulate the "Descanso Dominical"; the insurance against labor risks.

To the Catholic representatives of Jalisco in 1912 is due the glory of having passed the law of the family patrimony; that of proportional representation, and that of the legal recognition of the labor unions.

The advanced theses which have been sponsored by Catholic publications of social character regarding these matters are well known by Catholics all over the country. These publications were such as "The Christian Democracy" (La Democracia Cristiana), "The Mustard Grain" (El Grano de Mostaza), "The Furrow" (El Surco), "The Popular Union" (La Unión Popular); this latter had a special section entrusted to Dr. Traslosheros, devoted to the propaganda of the Catholic doctrine regarding the sharing in the profits.

In Tulancingo, Zamora and León, several agricultural Conventions were celebrated, the most important being: the first held in September, 1904, and the second in September, 1905. In these conventions among the points brought up for discussion were the condition of the field workers, the raising of wages, the anti-alcoholic campaigns, the protection of the infants, and the means of solving the problem of the peons' misery.

I have to mention Dr. José Refugio Galindo who has been the leader of the Catholic agrarianism and who, with a spirit of magnificent self-denial, traveled over a greater part of the country, many years before the revolution of Madero started, for the propaganda of sound and progressive agrarian doctrines.

During the "Fourth Social Mexican Week" held in Zacatecas from the twenty-third to the twenty-eighth of September, 1912, the points

under discussion were: "The Condition of the Indians," the "Usury among the Agriculturists," "The Distribution of Lands," "The Family Patrimony"; and an essay on agricultural federation was proposed.

Finally, in January, 1913, the Second Big Labor Diet of the National Confederation of the Catholic Circles of Workmen was held; the minutes were published the same year (*Tipografía de la Escuela de Artes, Zamora, 1913*) and they contain very interesting subjects; we might say that they include the just views we find in Article 123 of the 1917 Constitution, and even more favorable views regarding laboring men.

Although in several instances, the intentions and efforts made by the Catholic Church toward the promotion of the organization of the laboring classes, not only by influencing public opinion, but also by helping the organization of the laborers in view of their effective social and economic betterment, has been misrepresented, there has been an effective and well disposed effort, from her part, weak or strong, as the circumstances might have been favorable or unfavorable to her, perfect or defective, to help the establishment of organizations for the welfare of the laborers.

In the same way the Church previously promoted the organization of the Workmen Circles (*Círculos Obreros*), for their moral and professional advancement, so did she favor and encourage afterwards, the organization of the National Catholic Confederation of Labor which was organized in 1922 after a Convention held in Guadalajara in April of the same year, and attended by one thousand, three hundred and seventy-four Delegates, from different parts of the country. In August, 1926, the Confederation showed the following figures:

- 332 Labor Unions
- 17 Local Federations
- 14 Regional Confederations

with a total membership of twenty-two thousand, three hundred and seventy-four; and the following economic institutions, depending on the Labor Unions:

- 295 Insurance institutions for sickness
- 89 Death Insurances
- 26 Coöperatives of Consumption

- 22 Raiffeisen Banks
- 54 Night Schools for members of the Unions
- 28 Loan and Savings Banks
- 5 Fields for agricultural experimentation.

The Confederation had celebrated the following Social Agricultural Conventions: 9 in Jalisco, 5 in Michoacán, 2 in Coahuila, 1 in Aguascalientes, 3 in Guanajuato, 1 in Durango, 2 in San Luis Potosí, 1 in Zacatecas, 3 in Colima and 2 in Mexico, totaling 29 Conventions. Finally the Confederation promoted a three-week social course for its members, from July 12th to August 23rd, 1926, which was attended by a good number of delegates from several parts of the country.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that this movement in favor of the laboring classes, was initiated by the Church over ten years before the different Mexican Governments and other social forces took any effective participation in the *revindications* of the people of our days.

This proves that the Catholic Church even when maintaining herself on her strictly religious position, is capable of rousing interest in Mexico and promoting an important effort in favor of its social needs.

I may add that her participation in this kind of activities has been always in accordance with the orientation of the Holy Fathers, and when initiating and encouraging these organizations of the laboring people she never took upon herself to assume the economic or professional responsibility proper to said organizations, according to the law, which responsibility corresponds to that of the leaders.

Leaving aside all the efforts that the Church can make for the education of the laboring people, I wish to mention something of the greatest importance regarding the welfare of the workingmen. I speak of the evils brought to society in general, but particularly to the laboring classes, by alcohol and intoxication. If the laborer, in his hard struggle for life, had not against him intoxication, he would not be so miserable, but we daily realize the harm of such evil and the inadequate remedies which up to the present have been employed to check it.

I shall mention to you something which I witnessed, to show what

the Church can do for the popular morality in this respect. There exists in the State of Guanajuato, a city called San Francisco del Rincon, a city of 21,000 inhabitants and an agricultural and industrial center. The industry is the weaving of straw hats. In August, 1922, during a trip I was making for social investigations, I arrived there. Studying the social needs of the community, I found, among other social evils, intoxication as a cause of the misery of those poor men.

One day, one of the men called on me and told me of his efforts in behalf of his fellow men to correct intoxication, as he considered it the source of most of their sufferings. He explained to me that he used to take the men before an image of our Crucified Lord, and exhort them to make a sacrifice, for the love of God, for their own sake and for the sake of their families and to promise Our Lord, to keep away from drinking at least during a certain time, with the hope of overcoming it entirely. He himself had suffered the consequences of intoxication in his youth and could naturally persuade his companions.

I listened very attentively to the story, and to shape that beautiful and important idea wrote it down on paper. This was the start of a league of temperance which began with 12 or 15 members. I exhorted him to continue working with confidence in such enterprise.

A few months later the group had increased to 50, then to 500 and I remember that the last time I visited the city, I had to find a big yard to meet them, for there was no place large enough for the crowd to whom I was asked to speak.

Later on, I had this information from the civil authorities: "some saloons had been closed for lack of customers, and even the prison had been closed several days for lack of prisoners."

These are some of the results of the moral efforts of the Church from the temperance view-point. But this is not all. Later I received information about that city, and I am told that the temperance league has now a membership of over 2,000 men. And what is more encouraging is, that the moral benefits have come to have material results as they have established an insurance institution for sickness and death and a savings bank. Some of the members have 500, 700, 1,000 pesos saved, and there is one man who has over 6,000 pesos to his credit.

The source of this moral influence is the Catholic Church. The members of the League of Temperance gather every Sunday in the church. I saw them sitting for long hours in the courtyard near the church, resting and chatting. I inquired and was informed that the Church was for them a protection against the temptations they wished to overcome. They waited there all together for the hour of prayer and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

A priest was entirely devoted to their religious assistance and he tried to make them receive frequently the sacraments, which are the source of strength and courage necessary to fulfill one's duty.

Without the religious influence, without the participation of the priest in this work, such beautiful efforts could not produce such satisfactory results.

Efforts toward temperance extend now to various states and they deserve backing and help because the rise of wages will not bring any real benefit to the families if this evil is not energetically fought.

Once I had the opportunity of speaking about this to a prominent governor of the State of Guanajuato and I told him that I was convinced that neither the State alone nor the Church alone, nor private initiative alone, could solve effectively the labor problems; but that the coöperation of the three forces was necessary to obtain satisfactory results.

For the past years the Mexican problems could be resolved into a problem of peace. The real welfare of the Mexican people is essentially dependent on the reign of peace, a complete, just and durable peace.

There is no *social peace* in Mexico: the social classes are engaged in a hard struggle which is now developing and which will probably not lead us to an end soon. We have had no *political peace* in this country for the last decade. The political contentions are every day more bitter, and the divisions which they spread, are deeper also every day.

There is no *peace in the family*: The Mexican home is suffering very much and is going rapidly towards disintegration; the family ties are being weakened and with this weakness and possibly with their rupture, they open a path to uneasiness and discord.

There is no *spiritual peace*: the conscience needs an atmosphere

of sane liberty to move and to act in accordance with the divine law, the only real and sure basis for true peace.

This lack of peace logically brings, as a consequence, a progressive weakening of our collective life. The economic, political and social crises which develop in our midst are the evident proof of the lack of peace in my country.

The common welfare so much impaired by so many struggles is telling us that we need peace and that it is necessary to restore peace to Mexico, as the essential factor of our welfare. Furthermore, we need to work for peace in Mexico for international security. Today, in the age of internationalism, the evils of one country affect the other nations. No matter how insignificant a country may be, if it does not enjoy peace, the phenomenon of its unrest is felt farther than its frontiers.

Peace is an orderly concord between men. Peace in the family is an orderly concord between the members of the family; social peace is that same orderly concord among members of society.

Now then, this important problem cannot be unnoticed by the Church in Mexico. I would say more: she, who is the pacific institution *par excellence*, is the one in the best position to influence more effectively the return of peace to Mexico.

Undoubtedly, this problem of peace is of great importance to the country because it involves every aspect of our community, and cannot be solved by purely political means, either by laws or other solely human means. Peace has its see, in the heart of men, peace is concord, and therefore peace is not only "RESPECT TO OTHERS' RIGHTS" but also and principally the fulfillment of our duties of justice and charity.

Peace will not return if men's hearts are entangled purely by wealth, pleasure and material things which always tend to divide mankind. Peace is the fruit of love among men, and love is only real when we live up to the precept of our Lord Jesus Christ: "Love you one another as I have loved you" (John XV, 12).

The Catholic Church in Mexico has the principal part in the great task of bringing peace to the country. Moreover, she recognizes this task as her own mission.

Pope Pius XI has repeatedly insisted to the whole world, and in a

very particular way to Mexico, upon the necessity of peace for the good of the people and in the present instance for the good of Mexico. And in order to guide all Catholics toward this important work, to which the good of religion and country is entitled, he has recommended every Catholic all over the world to work in the Catholic Action, and he has specially recommended that, to the Mexican Catholics Catholic Action pursued by Him, over and out of every political party and from all politics of parties, use the good-will of everyone to hasten the return of real peace to the world.

This is the field for the future work of the Church. Naturally by giving this orientation to all her activities the Church already directs all her efforts to this great and noble aim.

Every day we feel more clearly the necessity of an effective coöperation of every Mexican in this work of national pacification, and therefore it will not be difficult that in these efforts of the Church many may associate even though they do not belong to her membership, if they have the sincere purpose of definitely procuring peace to Mexico, without which all welfare is illusion and every good aspiration unrealizable.

A year ago His Excellence the Apostolic Delegate roused his voice in the name of the Church reiterating to the statesmen her always sincere offering to "COÖPERATE WITH THEM IN EVERY JUST AND MORAL EFFORT FOR THE BETTERMENT OF THE MEXICAN PEOPLE." This offer is nothing but a new application of the permanent mission which the Church has been fulfilling in Mexico from the 16th century on to our days.

The Catholic Church although reduced to poverty, true to the accomplishment of her mission, at the price of heroic sacrifices if necessary and in spite of her lack of liberty, proves to be the most powerful moral force with which Mexico counts in order to effectively promote the welfare of the community.

The Church is ready for her pacifying mission; to that end she directs all her efforts and she anxiously awaits the day when all prejudices unjustly accumulated against her will have vanished, and, the loyalty and nobility of her views are recognized, she will be allowed to freely continue the fulfillment of her divine mission.

DR. VICTORIANO D. BÁEZ, of Mexico City, is a clergyman of the Methodist Church.

PROTESTANTISM IN MEXICO

REV. VICTORIANO D. BÁEZ

ABOUT sixty years ago, certain evangelical missionaries went through villages on the Mexican border, selling Bibles and preaching the Gospel. After travelling for awhile, they decided to establish themselves in some of the most suitable cities and villages, and thus the first evangelical congregations were founded in the northern part of the nation.

Almost at the same time a strong movement had been started in the Capital of the Republic in favor of religious reform. This movement was initiated by a group of liberal Jacobins at the triumph of the Republic over the Empire of Maximilian, and was strongly seconded by certain former Catholic priests, among whom figured prominently Francisco Aguilar, Manuel Aguas, and Agustín Palacios. These groups of dissenting Catholics and Jacobins held religious meetings in different halls of the Capital, and particularly in the streets San Juan Letran and Cinco de Mayo. Some time after, they sent a commission to New York City to confer with the Protestant Missionary Societies, to interest them in the establishment of evangelical churches in the Mexican Republic. The Missionary Societies sent their agents to make a survey, and after an exhaustive study, decided to send missionaries. These established themselves in the Capital and nearby cities, bought or rented buildings, and founded the first churches. Thus was Protestantism established in Mexico.

The first denominations were the Episcopalian, Baptist, Presby-

terian, Methodist, Congregational, and Friends. Then followed the Disciples, Reformed Presbyterians, Nazarenes, and Pentecostals.

In a little more than half a century, the force inherent in Protestantism has made itself felt in part only in the Republic, because its propaganda has been absolutely pacific—by means of argument and persuasion. There was a difference, naturally, in the first years, when there were excitement, controversies, and other violent manifestations between Protestants and Catholics. But afterwards the evangelical campaign was carried on without any sort of violence or compulsion, those interested confining themselves to preaching within their own churches and chapels, distributing the Scriptures and doctrinal pamphlets, and to intimate talks with friends.

In different places and at different times the Protestant congregations have had to pass through the crucible of persecution, even of martyrdom; but this is incident to the spreading of any doctrine in any country, and never should be a cause of discouragement. Even yet there is a definite campaign against Protestantism; but we disregard this, and zealously avoid violence, because our doctrine is the Gospel, a doctrine essentially affirmative, which must enter the mind and heart by means of reason and free reflection, until it forms part of one's personal conviction; on this account we try to present the truth simply as we understand that Jesus expounded it, assured of the goal which Jesus set when he said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

The foregoing exposition is to show that Protestantism in Mexico is not fighting to impose its creeds on Catholicism or any other branch of religion, but is trying to enter into coöperation with all the living forces in the country, social, philanthropic, cultural, and religious, for the moral elevation, social betterment, and complete redemption of the Mexican people.

In order better to fulfill this purpose and to avoid unnecessary expenditure the national territory has been portioned among the above-mentioned denominations, with the exception of two, limiting each, by compact, to the region assigned. This arrangement has given good results, stimulating effort and developing responsibility. Today there are evangelical congregations, though in small numbers, in all the states and territories of the Mexican Union. The national census of

1921 gave 94,000 Protestants in the whole country; we do not know what the census of the present year, 1930, will give, but calculations from various sources indicate some 110,000. Among the 16,500,000 inhabitants of Mexico, the 110,000 evangelicals are hardly a grain of sand, but in spite of this very small number, they are working well with the civil forces, society, religion, and the fatherland.

Allow me, for the better comprehension of the inherent forces and ideals of Protestantism, to touch upon the salient points of its activities.

1. Social and Philanthropic Work. This is composed of schools, hospitals, health and recreation centers, industrial homes, and temperance societies.

(a) Because of certain articles of the new Constitution of 1917, the Protestant primary schools were converted from parochial into private semi-official schools; if they had not been before, they were immediately incorporated into the official school system, without the closing of a single one. In truth, the day school is not absolutely necessary for Protestant religious instruction, because the young people of both sexes prefer to come to its Sunday Schools.

The evangelical schools were the first to introduce recreation, which caused much adverse criticism; calisthenics; debating and literary societies; singing classes; and secondary schools. All this is gradually being incorporated in a progressive way into the national educational system.

Further, Protestantism has no less than ten normal schools, which have sent forth a considerable number of teachers to almost all the States of the Federation; these are of value to the country because of their honesty, punctuality, competence, morality, and profound patriotism. Their nationalistic and revolutionary tendencies, in the larger sense, are well known to the high officials of our nation. One of the best histories of Mexico, used as a textbook in almost the whole Republic, comes from the pen and patriotic love of a Protestant teacher.

(b) The hospitals and health centers are at the disposition of any patient whatever, and no inquiry is made as to his religion. He is attended with efficiency and dismissed with affection. A patient in Guanajuato, grievously ill, asked for a priest for confession. One was

called immediately, the patient was confessed, and when the communion was administered, the Protestant employés of the hospital themselves arranged the altar.

(c) The recreation centers propose to substitute wholesome diversion for immoral attractions, and naturally their promoters receive the gratitude of society. Athletic exercises and a physical hygiene education program, like that of the Y. M. C. A., develop a higher type of manhood and womanhood. One of the big problems of youth the world over is to know how to entertain itself, to enjoy life nobly, to fill the soul with elevating visions, without falling into that which we call sin.

(d) The industrial centers give occupation to the unemployed, having always as motto, "Not alms, but opportunity to do something." These ventures are in their infancy, and it is a pity that, for lack of means, they are not multiplying and enlarging as could be desired. But the seed is planted; with the passing of time will come the fruit.

(e) Temperance societies are perhaps the most valuable social work of the Protestants in Mexico. When an evangelical church is established, a temperance society is organized at once. It is considered essential to the life of the believer. The individual who joins an evangelical community must necessarily renounce all spirituous drink; if he does not do so, he is never received as a member, and if, after being received, he falls into the vice of alcoholism, he is expelled without more ado. We do not believe that it is an exaggeration of principle, that it is a tyranny of fanaticism; it is simple obedience to the Gospel which says, "No drunkards shall inherit the Kingdom of Heaven." The practice is wonderfully efficacious for the elevation of the home and the increase of morality. Criminal statistics receive almost no increment from evangelical circles. With almost unimpeachable logic, Jesus Christ said: "Do men pluck grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

2. Cultural Movement of Protestantism in Mexico. In this connection something must be said of literature and the press.

(a) There was a time before the Revolution in which the Protestants edited eighteen or twenty periodicals, weekly, bi-monthly, or monthly, whose pages were filled with doctrinal articles, commentaries on the Scriptures, educational and patriotic matter. Some of

them sustained fiery controversies with Catholic periodicals of much influence, like *El País*, *El Tiempo*, *El Amigo de la Verdad*, *El Pueblo Católico*, and others; it was necessary for Protestant forces to defend themselves against unjust and virulent attacks, which gave impetus to unprecedented persecution in a country which had had a brilliant initiation into the paths of democracy and civilization.

Except for these controversies, the evangelical press has limited itself strictly to the exposition of its principles, the defense of moral interests, and the instruction of its readers. After the Revolution, this press was reduced by half, principally on account of the high price of printing; but as soon as general conditions in the country become normal, means will be taken to multiply the number of printed pages.

(b) The literature which Protestantism has produced is relatively small in amount, but of good quality, as may be proven by its book-stores and houses of publication. Its works are in general doctrinal and apologetic, without lack of lighter reading matter. In order to supply the lack of edifying books, publishing houses in Spain, Chile, and the Argentine Republic have been asked for material.

But Protestantism carries on its best cultural work by means of the spread of the Bible, in different editions and prices, never selling above the cost price. The Bible Agency on Gante Street, which is open every hour of the day, always shows the various editions of this marvelous book. This agency has sub-agencies in almost all places of importance, and besides, some twenty colporteurs. The reading of the Bible by any one, whatever his belief or character, must necessarily awaken the conscience and elevate it to a moral and humanitarian level above the average. The Lord of the Skies has said: "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away."

3. The Support and Independence of Protestantism. The Missionary societies of the United States have contributed indispensable funds toward the evangelical propaganda, but not sufficient for the construction of edifices which ought to be built at the first possible moment. The aid of the American societies has been for pressing needs—not for permanent construction. It is only the aid which a father gives a son before he has come of age. The small churches and chapels which Protestantism has today have been built to respond to the situation of the moment; but the true task of constructing temples in

conformity with the Latin taste has remained completely in charge of the Mexicans. Time will tell whether the Mexican Protestants are capable of realizing this work for the higher prestige of their cause. Self-support is evolving so satisfactorily that it may be asserted without exaggeration that for each peso which has come from outside, three have been raised in the country. In general, the churches established in the capitals of the States are self-supporting; aid, in greater or smaller quantities, comes to rural churches. A year ago, an evangelical denomination which has somewhat more than 10,000 members showed proper gratitude to the Mother Church and is now making the effort and sacrifice necessary to support itself, to administer its own affairs, and to carry on its work with its own means.

This is, naturally, the tendency and the definite aim of all evangelical Mexicans. The whole ecclesiastical government is under the direction of Mexicans; the Missionary Committees of the United States have never ordered measures which are contrary to the laws, customs, and integrity of human personality; the Mexicans have always been masters of their own independence of judgment and action, and have always fully discussed any proceeding before putting it into practice. For this same reason the Mexicans themselves have been the principal propagators of the Gospel and upon them rests the major part of the responsibility for success or failure in the work.

And here it is fitting to rectify an extremely unjust judgment which those, whether church people or intellectuals and politicians who wish ill to Protestantism, have formed. This is, that Protestantism is the advance movement of the pacific conquest of Mexico by the United States, and that the Mexican Protestants are the agents of this conquest. This judgment, doubly affirmed, is the falsest of the false, and absurd in all its implications. These short reflections are sufficient to show it:

(a) The separation between Church and State in the Mexican Union is complete, and was initiated and sustained from the beginning of its history by Protestant churches.

(b) For this work of conquest, the expenses should be paid by the officials of the government and bankers; but the government does not and cannot give money for this kind of propaganda. The bankers, on their part, have never burdened themselves with administer-

ing funds for religious expansion, and even should they offer funds for such a purpose (that is, looking toward evangelical conquest), the Protestant missions would reject such an offering with the indignation proper to the offended Christian, the same indignation which seized the Apostle Peter when he threatened Simon Magus with these words, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought to obtain for a price the gift of God; thou hast no part or lot in this matter."

No. The money which the missionary committee provide with a certain amount of sacrifice is for the evangelical folk in general, without other thought than the common good, without other object than the redemption of a neighbor. If this is called a conquest, then there is no doubt that we are all *conquistadores* mentally and spiritually, for some scientific or religious school.

As to the charge of the Mexicans, it is scarcely necessary to make any defense whatever. It is enough to say that a good proportion of the Protestant youth belonged to the army in the revolutionary activities in Mexico, because Protestantism in general always adheres to the causes of the people when these are just, and necessary for the vindication of their rights and the conquest of their liberty.

4. Concrete Spiritual Task. This is the supreme goal of Protestantism in the land of Hidalgo, Morelos, and Juárez. Some paragraphs from a brilliant oration given recently by a young Protestant in Mexico City will show this. He spoke thus: "The axis around which the evangelical work revolves, the eternal center of its mission, the fundamental and vital rôle of Protestantism in Mexico, is nothing other than putting the people in direct contact with the living Christ, whom they do not know as they should. To bring this people to the feet of Jesus, to present them intimately to Him—this is our task.

"The Catholic Church has accomplished grand things in Mexico. Their first missionaries were fathers to the Indians. They built churches. They founded schools. Their tireless ministers went throughout the country in all directions; they dwelt in most inclement and forbidding regions; many of them buried themselves all their lives among the Indians; many were heroes and many were martyrs. All of them preached of Jesus, and yet why isn't Jesus known as He should be known?

"Our people know very little the true Jesus, the simple, dynamic,

and superbly human Jesus of the Gospels. It is necessary to present this Jesus, whose marvelous qualities and character make Him the Ideal Man. We need to insist that a Christian is that person who lives a life like that of Jesus, reflecting in his humble person the glory of the Son of Man, because 'He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also so to walk even as He walked.' Jesus himself said, 'I have set you an example.' 'Learn of me . . . and ye shall find rest unto your souls.' We ought to insist that the ethics preached and personally demonstrated by Jesus, far from being a Utopia to be realized in the future life, is the only true solution of the problems of the individual and of society.

"That which is necessary for the man whose transgressions have opened an abyss between himself and his Lord is a Power which will save him from the terrific tyranny of sin, which keeps him prostrate in the slough of his miseries; he needs a Hand which will descend even to the depths to seize and raise him; a Love which crosses over the heap of his sins and comes to seek and to save him.

"Jesus is this Power, this Hand, this Love; Power which was obtained by fighting with sin on the cross; Hand which was perforated for our sins; Love which was wounded for us on Calvary."

In conclusion, the prime object of Protestantism in Mexico is to bring our people into constant and true contact with Jesus Christ, and to make Christianity the substance of life itself, causing them to recognize once for all that the Christian religion is not a ceremony, not a ritual, not a dogma, nor a penitence or sacrifice, but Love and Faith as they are reflections of God himself.

•

VI

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

•

ANTONIO ESPINOSA DE LOS MONTEROS, economist; graduate of Harvard University; member of the staff of the Ministry of Finance.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

ANTONIO ESPINOSA DE LOS MONTEROS

I HAVE been asked to speak on some important aspects of Mexican economic life. Though the task is difficult, I do not hesitate to undertake it, because it affords me an opportunity to greet this gathering of distinguished Americans, and also because I may be able to help to some extent in that noble search for a better understanding between our countries.

One must admit that there is always a tendency to show foreign visitors only the bright side of things. On this occasion, however, you will not need to guard against that tendency. When one considers the economic problems of my country, no one, not even the most patriotic Mexican, can hide the truth. What would be the use of speaking of prosperity and well-being if misery and poverty are to be found everywhere? Therefore, I will try to present to you two or three fundamental problems in a most sincere and unprejudiced manner.

Let us begin with the so-called agrarian question. Contrary to what many people think, this is not a new problem. It finds its roots far back in the times of the Spanish Conquest, and perhaps even Aztec times. If we want to know its present status, however, we must not dwell too long on the historical background. Suffice it to say that, during the last three centuries, there took place an unprecedented con-

centration of landed property, at the expense of a great number of individuals and communities, who had to join the ranks of the propertyless as plain *peons*. The explanation of the phenomenon is very difficult, but chief among the circumstances that led to it were: the political predominance of the Spaniard over the Indian; the ignorance of the latter as regards his legal rights; the grants and privileges given to the Catholic Church; unjust legislation concerning property titles; and the extensive exploitation of land, as in the case of cattle-raising and sugar-cane plantations.

The situation in 1910, just before the Revolution, shows to what extent land had been concentrated in a few hands. Of the three hundred million acres privately held, two-thirds were owned by about ten thousand people, while the remaining third belonged to some six hundred thousand individuals. It is really no wonder that people began to think of a land reform.

At first it seemed as if the aims of the Revolution had been merely political; to overthrow a dictatorship, to establish a true democracy, to give the states more freedom in their local affairs, and so on. Soon enough, however, there arose a general outcry for lands. Revolutionary leaders readily accepted the distribution of lands as an ideal in order to win the approval and the material support of the rural masses. Thus, once their forces had won the struggle, Carranza, their leader, had to make good the promise, and issued a decree setting forth all the general principles for the agrarian reform. Later, these same principles were embodied in Article 27 of the 1917 Constitution.

We are not particularly interested right now in the legal aspects, or any other aspects of the agrarian question. It is enough to state briefly the economic side of the Constitutional principles.

In the first place, all private property is subjected to the dictates of "public utility." This means that lands or any other form of property can be taken over by the Government, if there is a public purpose to fulfill. There is nothing radical in this limitation of property rights. For a long time this principle has been accepted and applied in many other countries. Notwithstanding, there is an innovation as regards the meaning of "public utility" in the Mexican Constitution. Here the expression covers expropriations not only for streets, parks and city improvements, but also for altering the distribution of rural

holdings, taking away land from those who have too much of it, and giving it to communities that need it badly, either in the form of restitutions or as plain donations.

In the second place, provision is made for "indemnification" on the basis of assessed values as registered in tax records, plus ten per cent of said value. For this purpose there will be issued Government bonds which the expropriated owners will be under obligation to accept. Here again, we find a departure from accepted forms of public expropriations. There is no doubt that this obligation was established so that the Government could carry out the reform without having to search too long for the necessary cash.

Finally, according to the Constitution, the lands "restituted" or "donated" are to be held, not individually, but in common fee by the villagers and pueblos to which they are assigned. That is, as regards the grants of lands under the agrarian principles, individual property is abolished. Communal lands cannot be mortgaged or sold; they are to be held *ad perpetuum* by the community itself. The reason for these restrictions is obvious: to prevent the repetition of combinations and abuses of former times. It was intended that the lands given to villages should constitute, so to speak, a sacred patrimony for all time, not to be altered in any way by the whims of coming generations.

Under this constitutional program, during the past decade, there have been distributed to villages some ten million acres, and approximately half a million rural people have benefited by it. That is, only about five per cent of big holdings have been affected by the agrarian reform; the rest is still untouched. Furthermore, the total amount of the agrarian debt has not as yet been fixed, but it is estimated at about three hundred million pesos.

Let us turn now to the economic consequences of the reform.

First of all, how has the policy affected agricultural production? It is very difficult to answer this question because there are hardly any reliable statistics covering a wide enough period. For this reason there is now much vehement discussion on the point. Considering pros and cons, it seems to me that the rural production in the country is about the same as it has always been. Naturally there have been some changes in the last ten years or so, but they are to be accounted for on very different grounds.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that the agrarian reform has checked to some extent, agricultural expansion. One of the logical consequences of the policy has been insecurity of tenure. It is generally recognized that, in many sections of the country, land owners are reluctant to expand their activities because they are constantly afraid of untimely expropriations. Furthermore, lands are often left idle on account of pending lawsuits as to the right of the Government to expropriate them. How powerful these influences have been and to what extent they have worked against the rapid growth of agricultural pursuits, is hard to guess.

The same insecurity of tenure has also affected land values and rural credit. Properties formerly valued highly have been selling for ridiculous prices. On the other hand, with depreciating values and insecure tenure, agricultural credit has been hard hit. In this respect, agrarian communities are no better off than private land holders, since their lands cannot be mortgaged for obtaining credit. Efforts are being made to build a system of rural credits for these communities on the basis of crop values or along coöperative lines. Up to now, however, it is a fact that Mexican agriculture cannot take advantage of the benefits of credit.

Finally, one of the most serious consequences of the land reform is the creation of an ever-growing public debt. One does not know yet just what proportions it will take when the land distribution is completed. Even now, however, the debt is already too burdensome for the public treasury. How and when will this debt be paid? Mexico is already burdened with all kinds of debts, as we shall see later on. Can she bear any more? In my opinion this is the crux of the whole agrarian question. The nation is counting on an uncertain future for paying for the lands that are expropriated today. Can we be sure that even in the long run agrarian communities will be an asset large enough to pay their original cost? Buying lands on credit and giving them away may be justified on moral, political or social grounds. Personally, I believe in the policy on those grounds. However, there cannot be any doubt that the game is quite dangerous from a right economic or utilitarian point of view. This consideration would be sufficient reason in other parts of the world for reconsidering and perhaps discarding any public policy. In Mexico, however, we are not

yet accustomed to think strictly on economic lines, and all probabilities point to the indefinite continuance of land distribution, despite all criticism coming from the economic quarters.

Now I should like to speak to you on other problems no less complex or important than the land question. The first one is that of the public debt. It has been calculated that the total debt of Mexico amounts to about three billion pesos. This includes the bonded debt, the agrarian debt, the debts to foreigners for damages suffered during the Revolution, and many other liabilities of the Mexican Government as guarantor of private and legal Government borrowings. Right now, I think it is timely to refer to the bonded debt, that is, the so-called foreign debt, which is, as a matter of fact, the only public debt Mexico has. The agrarian debt is still in its formative period, and all others are more of the nature of moral claims in the stage of study and discussion.

The origins of the so-called foreign debt are as complex as those of the agrarian problem. They may be traced back to the very beginning of our independent life. From the start Mexico's budget has generally shown annual deficits, and consequently public credit had to be used very often. Bad tax administration, the economic background of the nation, class favoritism, and costly political struggles may account for the situation. At any rate, today the debt in question is one billion pesos in round figures. Of this enormous burden, Mexico must have really cashed at most five hundred million. Half of the amount consists of overdue interest charges and commission fees charged by foreign bond houses for floating Mexican Government loans.

Can this debt be paid? If so, how and when?

Right now these fundamental questions are being discussed in New York. In the past they have been the source of much misunderstanding between our countries. That is why they deserve our special attention.

Even from the train window, you have already seen enough of Mexico to know that she is not as rich as you had been told. At least, you must have already noticed many signs of poverty: that Mexicans are a rather poor and shabby looking people and that their houses are in most cases plain primitive huts. Can you conceive of

burdening such poor people with higher taxes in order to pay for the lavishness and thoughtlessness of former rulers?

I am not saying or even suggesting that Mexico will not be able to pay what she owes. Without doubt our enormous potential wealth will be realized by us sooner or later. But my point is simply that for the moment things do not look bright for our creditors. The balance of trade, including visible and invisible items, has been against us since 1922, and the brand new American tariff will undoubtedly bring a more unfavorable situation. Our currency has been depreciating for ten years. Furthermore, the trend of public revenues in recent months is downwards. Silver mining and the oil industry, two important sources of private and public wealth, have been badly crippled by world conditions. Our staple agriculture is menaced by cheap imports from abroad. All these and many more ominous signs announce harder times for my country, and point out the necessity of postponing indefinitely the payment of the foreign debt.

For it must be recognized, as it has been in the case of Germany's debts, that it does not always pay to play the rôle of Shylock in international debt settlements. As a matter of fact it has also been recognized that, in many cases, it is even necessary to lend more money in order to collect past loans. Mexico has already shown, and is now showing again, her willingness to pay her debts. But why not give her a chance to tap foreign sources of capital for harnessing her natural forces and for acquiring an efficient production plant? Not only should the Mexican Government force its creditors to reinvest the proceeds of any debt settlement within its borders, but it should also try to convince them that more capital is needed to put Mexico on a paying basis. Unless both things are done, I fear very much for the economic future of my country as well as for the stability of any agreement that might be reached with our creditors.

Now let us consider for a moment our labor troubles. It may seem strange to you that in a semi-feudal, almost wholly agricultural nation, so much importance should be attached to labor disputes. I assure you that it is as strange to me. Industrialism, with all its evils, real and imaginary, is still very far from becoming a living, up-to-date fact in our midst. Of course, there are factories and mines, and there are

employers and employés. But real capitalism, such as you know it in your own country, is still unknown in Mexico.

How, then, is labor unrest to be explained?

In the first place, I think much of what is said and done is of little significance. In the past few years, the so-called labor unrest has been fundamentally political unrest. In Mexico, labor and politics go hand in hand, and the labor movement has had much to do with elections and government jobs. Only in a few cases, higher and nobler goals have been sought.

In a broader and truer sense, however, the unrest of Mexican labor may be attributed to an awakening of the workers to the advantages of a higher standard of living. Unfortunately for many of them, industry in Mexico is so backward that it cannot afford to pay higher wages. Before this can be done, much industrial progress has to be attained. For the time being, therefore, our industrial workers are doomed to get low wages.

In the meanwhile, Article 123 of the Constitution, which might be called the Magna Charta of Mexican labor, is in most cases inoperative. Of course, in the bigger towns and factories, the eight-hour day has been established, and perhaps other concessions have been obtained by labor. Generally speaking, the most advanced principles of Article 123 are not obeyed by employers and not enforced by employés. They remain rather as a safeguard for labor in the future. Indeed the time will come when our 1917 legislators will be thanked in earnest for having made provision for the distant future.

Now, do I think that present labor conditions in Mexico are really bad enough to prevent the growth of business and trade. In fact, to a great degree, the truer labor unrest is due to unemployment, and to low wages. All kinds of bona-fide concerns may very well prosper in Mexico, if only they can give the workers a fair deal. One of the greatest economic resources yet to be tapped is Mexican labor, because it is cheaper than labor in other countries. Yet those who would take advantage of it should be able to pay wages somewhat higher than those that are now paid. Only by doing so may an employer prevent serious labor difficulties in Mexico.

CHESTER LLOYD JONES, *director of the School of Commerce, University of Wisconsin; Commercial Attaché, Havana, Paris, Madrid; Special Representative from the United States Department of Commerce to Mexico; author of "Caribbean Interests of the United States," "Mexico and Its Reconstruction," "The United States and the Caribbean."*

THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF MEXICO

CHESTER LLOYD JONES

AFTER ANY revolution there comes a pause, a period of uncertainty, of readjustment. The people who have led the revolution feel that now is the time for them to consolidate the gains of the great cause for which they have sacrificed time and effort, and they try to take account of stock. That is true in every revolution. It was true in the American revolution, for the people who first furnished the inspiration for that great conflict as time went on came to realize that it was not possible "to win heaven in a day." They still kept their wagon hitched to a star, but they became more and more concerned to have its wheels on the ground.

Not only does there come a period of hesitation as revolution progresses, but there develops a tendency for the more extreme radicals to lose their influence and for a new set of leaders to take their place. Look back again on our own revolution! The Patrick Henrys, the James Otises, the Samuel Adamses, and leaders of that type, fell out of the principal public positions as the years went on. By the time the Constitution came to be framed there was quite a different set of men in control.

It seems to me that this generalization that I have made about revolutions applies to conditions in Mexico at the present time. In the Revolution that we are witnessing in this country—for the Revolution

is not over and is, after all, not only a political but a social revolution and takes, therefore, a greater time than one purely political—we are seeing the growth of a more conservative attitude on the part of the leaders of the Mexican people. There will not be a conservative reaction. The old times are not coming back in spite of what some old-timers are saying. They are saying that the glorious times of Díaz will return. They will never return. But there is a readjustment already in process. The leaders are looking forward, but not quite so far. It is a period of hesitancy in which the leaders want to take their bearings, to try to save what was fundamental and desirable in the old system and to consolidate the gains of the new régime.

There are still heard, of course, defenders of the most extreme points of view, advocates of discarding the whole economic system of old Mexico; but there are also heard voices which recognize that it is better to have half a loaf than no bread, that there were certain fundamentals in the old régime which are still fundamental, and that it is better not to risk failure of the entire revolution by trying to obtain all the benefits originally sought for.

Even in the great agrarian problem that is still agitating the Mexican public we find people like ex-President Calles making declarations to the effect that "unless we can modify our present standards and make of greater promise our agrarian program, there is very great danger that it may become a fiasco."

The long-standing oil controversy is being settled partly by compromises to try to arrive at means by which the national production of oil can be increased without sacrificing the standards Mexico has set in controlling the industry. After all, when you consider that the production of oil has decreased from 193 million barrels a year in 1921 to 44 million barrels in 1929, even the most enthusiastic may wonder whether some adjustment ought not to be brought about in that economic field.

Also in budgetary matters, in the handling of public finances, we find the Secretary of the Treasury making a statement to the effect that, after all, hereafter, the Mexican government had better not take any lands which it cannot pay for by appropriations carried in the budget itself. It does not pay Mexico to run indefinitely into debt, through issue of bonds for the purchase of lands for the Indians,

however desirable it may be that Indian ownership of land and initiative in its use be increased.

There may still be upsets, readjustments of an unexpected character may occur, but the attitude of those in authority is more and more coming to be adjusted to a practical standard. The economic adjustments that will occur are going to be very extensive. The task of directing them is one which, like the changes to be accomplished, is very much greater than was the case in the United States at the end of our revolution.

The Spanish colonial system so far as its economic factors are concerned was one that emphasized social and economic stability—some people would call it stagnation. It was, in any case, an economic system based on class control arbitrarily limiting contact with the outside world. The period of independence that followed, right down to our own days, has been one which has also had these characteristics to a high degree.

Mexico is still a country very largely unleavened by contact with the outside world. It is still class-governed, still a country in which economic development is held back by a large number of factors. The character of the land-holding system has limited development. The communication facilities are very imperfect, even though the Díaz régime showed marked development in railways. These are circumstances which kept Mexico, until the coming of the revolution, at least, in a condition which did not allow it to be played upon by the great economic forces shaping developments in other parts of the world.

Contrast some of the other factors that stand out as different in Mexico from what you find in the United States or Europe. The population in Mexico is one to which very little has been added since Spanish colonial times. The ethnic elements in it have been modified by no such stream of immigration as has changed the racial face of the United States. Then there are to be borne in mind great agricultural contrasts. In the United States there are tremendous areas which can be given over to the raising of staple crops, with the result that there come to exist great surpluses for export and an abundance for home consumption. There is no such thing in Mexico. There are no great areas that raise the same crop. There is only one crop that

is produced in large amounts, so large as to be exported in considerable quantities—that of henequen, the fiber from which binder twine is made. Mexico has no great areas used or which can be used to produce foodstuffs for export. She has, in fact, up to the present, hardly shown herself able to produce foodstuffs sufficient for her own demand, a condition which is well illustrated by the conditions in current years.

In the United States and Europe great railways and highways crossing the land in every direction have developed. No such thing has occurred in Mexico. Even as late as 1830, when the British Ambassador brought a carriage to Mexico, he could get it only as far as Veracruz because of the bad roads. To be sure, in 1830 the British Ambassador's wife complained of the conditions of the streets in Washington! She couldn't use her carriage there, the mud was so deep. But after 1830 there was a tremendous development of commercial facilities in the United States, binding the country together and making it a national unit. The economic development of the country was made possible and the great natural resources of the country came into use. No such thing happened in Mexico. The greater part of freight is still carried by man-back and mule-back. It is possible to get a carriage from Veracruz to the Capital now; still, general travel by carriage over the whole country is quite impossible.

Another great limitation on development in Mexico has been the character of its government. Class governments in Mexico continued even to the Revolution, and some critics would say that situation still obtains. Only a small part of the people in Mexico take an active interest in the running of the government. This will continue to be the case, at least until the educational program which the government has now outlined can come to have a real influence on national life.

Since 1900 the economic conditions under which Mexico has been working have rapidly changed, partly because of economic changes going on outside of the Republic, and partly because of conditions within the Republic. In the last generation international trade has tremendously increased. The mileage of railways has been greatly extended. International communications by sea have been greatly improved. All these things have brought Mexico, which had been protected from outside economic influence, into contact with other nations

more since 1900 than in one hundred years previously. The international trade of Mexico in the period since 1900 has increased almost threefold. This shows, in general, the marked difference in conditions that Mexico now faces compared with what they were when some of us were boys.

As a result of this new set of conditions there has arisen confusion in the economic organization of the country, confusion that has been much accentuated by the developments since 1910. Bewildering conditions have come to face the leaders in Mexican economic life, unexpected developments of all sorts with which they are very unfamiliar and with which they do not know how to deal if, indeed, some of the conditions can be dominated.

It is worth while examining in greater detail some of the lines in which the leaders of Mexico are now uncertain as to what policy should be pursued.

What is Mexico's attitude as to immigration—a factor which might change the economic status of the country in a very far-reaching manner? One group is highly critical of any influx of foreigners. They want none of it. They say in effect that Mexico has never had it and does not want it now. "Mexico for Mexicans" should be the ideal. They advocate adopting alien land laws so as to make it difficult for foreigners to settle in the country. They defend taking action against agricultural corporations so that foreigners cannot hold any great amount of land on a coöperative basis in the interior of Mexico.

On the other hand, we find all through the history of Mexico that the government has spent much money, and indeed is still doing so, to encourage immigration. The establishment of foreign colonies in all parts of the country has been advocated in order that the immigrant foreigners may show the population by example the best agricultural methods. In fact, throughout the history of Mexico encouragement of immigration has been the regular government policy. Through most of its history Mexico has regretted the fact that there has not been a great stream of immigration coming into the country.

How about emigration? Here also there is evidence of bewilderment in the attitude of many Mexicans. It is criticized: "We do not want to have any emigration. We Mexicans need all our yeomen in our own country. At a time when we are anxious to have our national

resources developed it is a national disaster to have emigration develop to the degree that, as at present, one in sixteen born in Mexico lives in the United States. We ought to do everything we can to favor limitation of emigration of the most valuable class of our people. From the point of view of national economy any such emigration northward as is occurring is a big calamity." On the other hand, we find people arguing, "Any restriction of emigration is a reflection on our nationality. All of the people in the New World ought to be considered brothers and friendly migration ought to obtain in all the new countries." Mexicans do not have any clear idea yet as to what ought to be their national policy on this question.

As to industrialization, we find there is the same sort of confusion. We are told "Mexico is proud of its native arts. We must save them to save our souls. We must do all we can to make sure that the fine products of Mexican civilization shall be safeguarded." I am sure all of us sympathize with that attitude. Yet what is happening? Mexico is turning her back as rapidly as she can on these very arts she would like to preserve. Some of you have bought *zerapes*. I would be much surprised if any of them had been dyed with native vegetable dyes, such as the old Brazil-wood reds, the Palo Tinto blacks and the Cochineal carmines. These can still be produced, but they are not produced. The whole country is turning toward the industrialization that surrounds it. As you walked to the Paranifo this morning, the first part of the street you found filled with shops intended for foreign trade in which there are Mexican goods. In the other sections you found shops for natives, in which foreign goods are sold. Mexico does not know what she wants to do in the way of industrialization. The Mexicans realize that they want to keep their old arts, but they realize, on the other hand, that to make Mexico economically strong they must encourage local industries by setting up high tariffs to encourage the growth of local industries producing the sort of goods which are manufactured abroad and for which dependence is now on imports.

What is the attitude in Mexico as to foreign capital? There exists in certain groups harsh criticism of the foreign capitalist. We are told, "He pays low wages; he drains off all of our wealth and makes us as hirelings of the foreigner. We do not like that. We will pass special

legislation against the advance of foreign enterprises." Thus one class speaks. They would make the foreigner promise never to appeal to his home country in case he gets into trouble in Mexico. Nevertheless, there is another group made up of those who realize that it is the experience of all new countries if they are to develop rapidly that they need to make conditions favorable for the entry of foreign capital, and the government is doing all it can to encourage the coming into Mexico of all sorts of foreign interests. Foreign capital is invested in all the industries in Mexico.

How about foreign influence in general? It is primarily American. Why? Because we are so near and have such close relations with Mexico. "Foreigner" comes to be synonymous with "American." What is the government doing about foreign influence? Is it discouraging or encouraging it? The government is taking a dual attitude. It frowns upon the naming of suburban developments with American names. It frowns upon the use of English titles in moving picture shows and the introduction of English talkies. And yet business houses generally recognize the popular appeal of foreign goods. In American schools opened in Mexico one finds that the great majority of students are Mexican. In the building of roads the government is using American engineers and methods, it is encouraging the use of the American telephone and telegraph, it is adopting American methods and curricula in the agricultural schools. While there is a general protest against "Americanization," which is in reality bringing the country into contact with western civilization, at the same time the government and the people are steadily bringing themselves into closer and closer contact with the influence of the outside world. This doubtless will continue. In the long run adaptation to standards outside Mexican national borders will occur—is occurring now and at a rate never before approached.

In this confused development what can a foreigner see as the influences which are to shape Mexican economic progress? It is going to be Mexicans who will determine what that progress will be. I want to call your attention now to some of the factors which, it seems to me, are going very largely to control what Mexico can make of herself, what she can expect to be, and what the world can expect her to do with the resources at her command.

Let us assume that the government is probably going to allow things to fall into line with conditions in other countries and let us see what are the strong and weak points of the Mexican economic position.

What about the industrial capacities of the people? This is a basic question. There are enthusiasts who believe that the Mexicans are going to be a great industrial people and others who say they have no industrial capabilities. If we are impartial we must say that we do not know what the capacities of the Mexican people are going to be in an industrial way. In the first place, what people do we mean? Do we mean the people of the outlying districts or the people of the City of Mexico and similar groups in other cities? To date most of the Mexican people have been untried industrially, so we must admit the most we can say lacks definiteness in very great degree. In the second place, what have the Mexican people to do with? Here we can be more explicit. As we look over Mexico we must admit that the agriculture of the country has thus far been poorly developed, that there are certain limitations in Mexican agriculture that make it difficult to believe that Mexico will ever be one of the great agricultural countries. The present methods of cultivation are poor. You have all seen, as you have taken trips, the use of the old wooden plow. It is still in common use in a very large part of the country. Undoubtedly Mexico will ultimately adopt methods of cultivation obtaining in the more advanced agricultural communities. She will in time get better seed selection. With better cultivation and seed there will be a better yield per acre.

Corn is the greatest agricultural crop of Mexico but at the present time the single state of Iowa raises over five times more corn than all the states of Mexico. Similar comparisons may be made for other crops. There will come better agricultural methods, with the result that Mexico will be put in a much stronger position with respect to crops than at the present time.

Mexico, however, will never become a great exporter of cereals. If she raises enough corn to support her own people she will probably do as well as can be expected. Probably of some of the grains, particularly wheat, Mexico will always be an importer, for the wheat grown in Mexico is not of the best composition for the making of

bread. It is, however, to be expected that Mexico may look forward to a much stronger position in agriculture than she now holds.

How about mining? Historically, mining has been one of the most important of Mexican economic activities. Take the production of silver, such an important mining product of Mexico. From 1521 to 1886 on the average 225,000 kilos of silver were mined a year. But that was only a beginning. From 1886 to 1924 the yield per year was 1,772,000 kilos. Last year, so great have been the improvements in the methods of mining that 3,381,000 kilos were mined—over 7,000,000 pounds—in spite of the fact that the price of silver on the world market is steadily declining. New processes have made it possible to handle low-grade ores that formerly could not be handled at a profit.

Mexico continues to turn out more and more silver, while the price goes down. There are a number of reasons for this. Silver as a basis of coinage has been gradually abandoned by one country after another outside of the New World. It has become a material for the arts rather than a basis for currency. When the Great War came practically all European countries turned from silver as a base for currency. It is to be doubted whether silver will ever regain its former position in use in coins. India has gone over to the gold standard, and in current years the Far East, instead of being a great importer of silver, has come to export it. The result has been that instead of being able to sell her silver at \$1.04 an ounce, as occurred at one time during the World War, Mexico has been getting less and less and she gets now about 38c. This is a great blow to the mining industry of the country. Unless new uses in the arts can be found or some other new demand for silver arises, the prospect for that branch of mining in Mexico is not favorable.

Mexico has rich resources in copper, lead and zinc, three metals the world demand for which is steadily increasing. By the use of modern machinery these metals can be produced in great quantities, but, unfortunately for Mexico, many other countries also have large resources of these metals. At the low world prices these metals may bring it is a question as to the degree to which Mexico can compete successfully with other countries in the production of these metals.

We must also speak of the petroleum production of Mexico. This industry dates from 1901, and in its great development from 1910.

The revolution profited by this fact, but the revolution in its public policy toward petroleum has developed a program which has seriously cut down the Mexican petroleum out-turn, with the result that instead of producing 193,000,000 barrels as in 1921, Mexico now produces only about one-fourth of that amount. This result is not due to an exhaustion of Mexican oil resources. The indications are that the production can be brought back if the government so wishes. One of the chief factors in the cutting down of Mexico from the position of second producer in the world which she once held, is the policy of the Mexican government in taxing petroleum heavily. There are taxes on the export of petroleum and on its production amounting to 52c per barrel. Petroleum is a valuable resource which Mexico can some day utilize to a high degree, but at present the government does not adopt a policy which favors the development of the industry.

In regard to mining prospects, then, what can we say? This depends on the rise of new demands for silver, the competition in other base metals, and, in the case of petroleum, on the national policy that is adopted toward it.

What about manufacturing? What are the prospects that Mexico may become a great industrial nation? Here again, what will occur depends to a large degree on the aptitudes of the people and on the resources they can command. In this field the greatest limitation Mexico has is the fact that there are in the Republic no great resources of coal, no large waterfalls, no great resources of iron. Other industrial materials, so far as these are metals, are here in great abundance. With the single exception of henequen, great supplies of textile fibers are not produced. It looks as if Mexico, in manufacturing, would have to be content with a limited development.

Industries can be developed in Mexico. Steps in that direction have already been taken. One of the most characteristic economic developments in Mexico recently has been the building up of a large number of small industries. But most of them depend and will continue to depend on foreign raw materials for the elements that go into the manufactured products. Behind high tariffs Mexico can become a manufacturing country, provided the aptitudes of the people allow her to do so, especially in the lighter transforming industries, but the possibility that she can become a country producing large quantities of

manufactured goods for export is remote. Mexico may, however, develop within herself a fairly active and healthy domestic market. That she can greatly strengthen her trade balance thereby is beyond doubt.

In foodstuffs Mexico can probably become self-supporting in most lines and in some cases she certainly should do much better than she now does. It is ridiculous for Mexico with her agricultural resources to import large amounts of corn, edible fats, eggs, meats and foodstuffs of other sorts. The greater part of these imports come from the United States so that I am for the moment talking against American interests! Most of the Mexican trade is with the United States. From the Mexican point of view it is certainly questionable whether the Republic ought to allow the continuation of the importation of such foodstuffs. In 1929 Mexico imported 2,250,000 dozen eggs, 62,000,000 pounds of lard, 1,000,000 pounds of condensed milk, almost 1,000,000 pounds of butter. All of these can be produced in Mexico, and under proper guarantees to private property certainly could be produced in Mexico in larger quantities than is now the case. In the industries, especially the lighter industries, Mexico ought to be able to supply herself behind high tariffs. A high degree of industrialism does not seem likely.

What can she sell abroad? Substantially the things she now sells abroad: raw materials, chiefly; manufactured goods, comparatively little. There has been a rapid development in Mexican foreign trade since 1900. When Díaz first came into control in 1872 imports and exports were \$20,000,000 and \$29,000,000 respectively. By 1910, at the time when he was about to surrender his power, imports amounted to \$205,000,000, exports \$293,000,000—each having increased tenfold. Since the Revolution it is not to be expected that things would go ahead quite so rapidly in foreign trade. Still, as compared with 1910, there is a fair increase. Unfortunately that increase is not as good as the picture might indicate, for the value of money has so gone down that part of the increase is a mere paper increase. In fact, the check to Mexican agricultural development has been so great that imports and exports have about leveled off.

In this foreign trade that has had such a growth, trade with the United States stands out as the dominant factor, to the great advan-

tage of both countries. The growth of Mexico's foreign trade is naturally with the nearest country with a great industrial development, producing in her area highly varied products.

Great hindrances to the development of this trade existed in times past. At one time the feeling toward the United States was such that when it was proposed to build railroads to connect the two republics, great opposition was shown in Mexico. Some railroad contracts were issued on condition that the railroads should be built from the south north, in order that the contact with the United States should be put off until the latest moment. The growth of communications between the two countries has been, of course, to the great advantage of both. The great industrialization of the United States has more and more drawn exports north and has made possible, over the same railways, shipments southward of larger and larger amounts of American manufactured goods, and of some raw materials as well.

As a result, while two generations ago Great Britain dominated the foreign trade of Mexico, at the present time that condition is not only reversed, but the leadership of the United States is much greater than that of Great Britain at any previous time. Of the imports into Mexico 68.2 per cent are from the United States and 69 per cent of Mexican exports go northward. Seven-tenths of all that Mexico sells we buy. Of all that she buys seven-tenths comes from us. So important has American trade come to be in Mexican life that at the present time Mexico imports from us about three times as much as she imports from Great Britain, Germany and France together, and in exports our preponderance is even greater.

Of course, there is this awful United States tariff! That must give, we are told, some ground for irritation to Mexico. Even there, however, relations are much more favorable than we might suppose. The great majority of Mexican goods enter the United States without paying any duty at all. Of all that Mexico sends us 73.8 per cent pays nothing. Even under the new tariff this condition will be changed very little, if at all. In passing, one might mention that the American goods in Mexico receive not quite so favorable treatment. From 70 to 75 per cent pay duties. Every country has a right to determine its own tariff, however, so I do not say this in any spirit of criticism. The fact that American goods pay tariffs more frequently and at

higher rates on entering Mexico than do Mexican goods in the reverse case, does not indicate unfriendliness on the part of Mexico. Neither does our treatment of Mexican goods show that we are especially "generous" to our southern neighbor. It is to the advantage of Mexico to put taxes on our goods. It is to the advantage of the United States to let Mexican goods in greater percentage come in freely.

All in all, the economic outlook of Mexico seems to justify the belief that her resources are such that they ought to make the country independent of foreign sources of supply in great part, and its resources are such as to guarantee a fairly active foreign trade. The position of the Republic both as to domestic and foreign trade can and will become stronger. If Mexico maintains public order and guarantees to private enterprises the protection which will encourage their growth, it will show a steady economic advance even though, like all other countries, she will never become economically independent—for no country in our day is completely economically independent. As time goes on and economic development occurs, Mexico should become more and more a country which is glad to emphasize the interdependence that it finds to characterize its position in relation to other countries. It will win a stronger position, too, primarily through its own efforts. Great as international relations are and important as they are, they are not nearly as important, in fact, as popular discussions would lead us to believe. Mexico will become economically great as her people become economically great. The problems of Mexico are primarily Mexican problems and an outsider can do little to solve them. One of the big problems talked about now in Mexico is the splitting up of great estates. If it comes it will affect Mexicans primarily. Comparatively seldom will it affect foreigners. If it is a good thing, Mexicans will be primarily the persons to profit. If bad, they must take the consequences. The distribution of lands to the Indians touches foreigners only in relatively few cases. Only some 460,000 hectares held by foreigners have been affected. If the agricultural program is a great success economically, Mexico will profit by it; if not, Mexicans will be the ones to suffer. Even in the case of oil only a very small fraction of the oil resources of Mexico have been developed. If Mexico decides that she does not want them developed any further, she is at perfect liberty to set that standard.

All this results in the simple conclusion, however complex the background may be, that the relations of Mexico to other nations are only the relations of any other nation to the rest of the family of nations. Every foreign state has the right and duty to protect its own citizens' interests in Mexico, just as Mexico has the right and duty to protect the rights of her citizens in other nations. In the long run, however, what the foreigner can do is very little in affecting what Mexico will be. Mexico will become strong as soon as the Mexicans make her so.

VII

THE AGRARIAN AND LABOR SITUATION

*ANTONIO DÍAZ SOTO Y GAMA; formerly Congressman and
head of the National Agrarian Party of Mexico.*

THE AGRARIAN MOVEMENT IN MEXICO

ANTONIO DÍAZ SOTO Y GAMA

I HAVE come here not to represent the classic truth, but the real truth, dry as it is. Had I known that I could not speak the truth in this place I would not have come.

I wish that you might know the principal and basic problem of Mexico—the agrarian problem. When the present time does not fill the needs and aspirations of a man such as myself because of its materialism, because it is based upon the value and power of the pursuit of pagan happiness and conditions that are intimately related to our material well-being, there remains for such a man either to go back into the past or to have faith and trust in the future. At the present time my condition is such that I wish to go back into the past and, therefore, I shall speak to you upon the general history of the agrarian movement in Mexico.

It has often been said both in Mexico and abroad that Mexico is unable to govern itself. This is not true. Real causes, motives that are deep in our history have been the cause for our perpetual revolutions and instability. In order to cite one of your own intellectuals I shall give you a quotation from Franklin, a man of practical ideas, not a dry intellectual. He said: "From the empty granary the blood flows to the street." Victor Hugo also made the same statement in a different form: "Extreme misery engenders profound rancor. Hunger makes a deep hole in the heart of the people and when it is unable to withstand it any longer an explosion comes and with it the revolution." The cause of all our revolutions has been hunger, misery, lack of equality.

It is difficult for a North American to come to our country from a country where the contrasts are not so marked, where equality is more nearly secured, and understand these conditions of extremes to be found among our people. It is not an agrarian like myself who speaks thus, but rather Baron Humboldt, a European, who when he came to Mexico said that Mexico was the country of inequalities. In Mexico today there are men who have an income of 150 to 200 pesos a day and at the same time there are men who during a year will have not even 100 pesos. There are *peons* in the country whose daily wage is only 18 centavos *plata*. Under these conditions of complete inequality and lack of permanent equilibrium there cannot be for a long time a condition of peace.

The fundamental problem of Mexico is not that of education. The fundamental problem of Mexico is that of race relations. You do not have this problem of races because your first colonists solved it in a very efficient way. You did away with the Indians. You see that I am complying with my promise to speak the truth and with entire frankness. I want Mexico to be friends with the United States, but on the basis of frankness. I believe that the future of humanity lies in the organizing of the races on the basis of justice and mutual understanding; but this basis of mutual understanding and harmony cannot be brought about if one race, because its face is white, declares itself superior to the other races. I believe that this is one of the fundamental problems of the races at the present time. The white race is very proud of its dominance and power and of its civilization. The question that we ask is: Should the white race be satisfied with its civilization at the present time? I do not believe that the white race is at heart satisfied with civilization just as it is constituted, and I do not believe that they are inclined to be proud of a civilization that produced the Great War. This Great War was not brought about by the yellow race, the black race, or the red race, but exclusively by the white race, and because of that it has no reason to be proud of its alleged super-civilization.

This is only one aspect of the predominance of the white race. Another is to be found in its economic power, which is in the hands of a very few, an extremely few, bankers, who now largely have the

resources of the country in their hands and impose their dominion over a great many people.

I have gone this roundabout way in order to come to the conclusion that it seems to be the belief of some North Americans, not all but some of them, that for a man to be perfect he must have 100 per cent of white blood in his veins. This is a total error. We in Mexico do not have the prejudices of the white race. We do not believe that because a man has a black face he has less of a human personality. This was clearly stated by Jesus Christ, the Master of us all, who recognized in each one the true worth of human personality. We in Mexico are also extremely proud of our Indian extraction. We prefer the Indian blood that runs in our veins to the small amount of white blood from European extraction.

The thesis of the mixture of races, especially with reference to the fact that a race may be considered inferior if it has any mixtures from any other race, is fundamentally unsound. There is only one pure race in the world today and that is the Basque race. What has it produced? Woodchoppers and pelota players! It is a fact that the mixture of races results in a group which is far superior to a pure race.

Let us look at a few concrete examples. France today in many respects marches at the head of civilization, not so much from a material standpoint as from an intellectual and spiritual standpoint. After all, we cannot measure civilization in terms of machines and airplanes; otherwise the most civilized man would be the aviator and the chauffeur. France has produced a real civilization and she owes her position to the mixture of the Gauls and Germans. Germany owes her civilization to the mixture of numbers of races that have come to her territory, and in North America, if you produce a civilization, it will be because of the mixture of Poles and Germans and Irish and Scandinavians and other races that have poured into your country, some of which you like and some of which you don't.

All this is necessary in order to understand the racial condition in Mexico, the condition of the life of two races in Mexico, a condition which in order to bring about an ideal situation must be considered from the standpoint of life developed in complete harmony of the two races respecting one another; not living together so that one race, the white race, oppresses and keeps the Indian race in such

a condition as to make it necessary for this Indian race to revolt and with arms overthrow the yoke imposed by the other race.

Now I can say to you that we have arrived at the bottom of the agrarian problem in Mexico. In order that you may not feel that I am speaking to you as an agitator I am going to base what I have to say on the words of a viceroy to New Spain in the year 1670: "It has been commonly felt that the conservation of the two Republics, the Indian and the Spanish Republics, is at counter purposes, and the only way in which this may be obviated is that we are persuaded that it will be easy to conserve the mutual needs and understanding of the two races, giving their prerogatives to each one so that they may not pass the line of their needs and privileges in each case."

As I love the concrete and not the vague in considering these problems, I wish to say very specifically what I believe to be the only solution to the problem, and that is to give each Indian a parcel of land on which he may be considered independent and free. This is not the theme of an agitator on agrarian problems, but rather this is the thought of the statesman. I quote again from the Duke of Mendoza: "In order to bring about proper conditions, the only way to solve our problems is to give the Indians lands, the lands which they may need for a long time and to give to the Spaniard the rest of the lands. I do not see in what way this could damage the rights of one group or the other group of the races. On the contrary, I believe that mutual understanding would develop because of this." This, then, which has been considered a tremendous problem on the part of reactionaries in Mexico and the United States resolves itself into a very simple problem and a simple solution. Give the Indians the lands which they had long before the Conquest and give the lands to them at once and turn the rest of the lands over to the white man. Mexico is a country large enough to be able to take care of this restoration of lands to the Indians who owned them originally and, at the same time, provide handsomely and generously the lands that the white men must have—the white men who came after the Conquest and those who may come later.

Now you may understand why Mexico has been given over to revolution. The reason for it is that injustice was done the Indians. I quote from Alexander Humboldt, speaking in 1799: "The welfare

of the white race is intimately related to that of the Indian race, and there cannot exist lasting happiness in both Americas, North and South, unless this race, the Indian race, humble but not made servile in the midst of its long subjugation, may come to participate in all the benefits that are consistent with progress and civilization and the betterment of the social order." Even though in this year of our Lord 1930 I hardly believe there is any one man that will contest the rights of the Indians to possess these lands which have been given back to them, nevertheless I consider the words of a faithful abbot in France, when the nobles and the lords came to him and said, "It isn't just for us to be dispossessed of our own lands which were conquered by the sword by our forefathers." He replied, "My dear sirs, if it was right for your forefathers to conquer these lands by the aid of the sword, then the French peasants have every right to reclaim them from you by the aid of the sword." And that is what we have done in this Revolution.

I shall quote further from the writings of a Spanish bishop who came to this country and felt that there was a distinct opposition on the part of the few Spaniards, who perhaps numbered a tenth of the population of the country, against the many Indians, who numbered nine-tenths of the population, and felt that this opposition of interests was to be considered inevitable between those who have everything and those who have nothing, that the oppression of the one group and the hardness of spirit of the other group could not be done away with unless there were justice and equality reestablished.

In spite of the simplicity of the problem, the landed classes in Mexico have been able to postpone its solution in a number of ways. At the time of the Mexican Independence from Spain in 1810 both Hidalgo and Morelos, the leaders of this revolution, had placed as one of the basic reasons of the independence movement the restoration of the lands to the Indians, but the landlords, aided by the nobles and the clergy, brought about the Plan of Iguala, in which it was specifically stated that the lands should belong to the white men, that they should remain in the hands of the landed aristocracy, and that the Indians should continue in their condition of servitude. Then came numerous laws and codes during a century in Mexico which did not solve the problem.

In 1857 the president of the Constitutional Convention, the illustrious Ponciano Arriaga, one of the most talented men Mexico has ever produced, presented the problem as follows: "No wonder, then, that the people see the coming and going of constitutions, that one after another convention meets, that the codes are growing larger and larger, that we see new provisions and plans for the good of them, that after so many sacrifices there is nothing of positive good to the people, nothing of profit to these classes whence come the ones that give their blood in our civil war. Whence come the people that fill our prisons, and that labor in our public works, and that, in one word, have and must support all of the bad things in society and not receive one of the good things from it."

This question of justice cannot possibly be solved until it has been fully understood by our present civilization. Justice does not necessarily mean machines of war, cannon and guns, airplanes, and thousands and thousands of dollars with which to conduct the war. Justice is a simpler formula, and if it is not given to the Indians, then there will surely come a revolution, whether you call it the French Revolution or the Civil War or the Mexican Revolution. Such must be prevented through the use of justice. One Mexican thinker has expressed the problem in this way, that in Mexico there are only two parties, one that wish that the Indian might eat to his fill and the other that wish that the Indian might not eat.

Zapata, one of the greatest revolutionists of Mexico; in fact, I wish it might be made known through my lips that he was the greatest of all revolutionists in Mexico, said: "They are pursuing me, the Carranza forces are pursuing me, simply because I want the Indian to eat and I want justice to be done to him."

Before you leave Mexico I wish that you might be able to consider this concrete truth, that the Mexican Indian, tired of constitutions and legal papers giving him the right to vote and freedom of the ballot, freedom of expression and freedom of worship and other types of theoretical freedom, rebelled not because he wanted further freedom, but because he was hungry. These theoretical conditions of freedom did not give him the bread to eat to satisfy his hunger. The only way he could do it was through the harvest of the grain which he himself had planted in the small lot of land which he had

reclaimed from the *conquistadores* or from the descendant of the *conquistadores*.

I become desperate at the number of excursions of North American tourists that come into this country and spend good money and time and, perhaps, health in order to learn something about Mexico. They come to Mexico and they leave thinking they know Mexico because they have seen the Cathedral and the National Museum and the churches, because they have been visited by officials who have told them that everything is lovely in Mexico, that our education is fine, that the climate is fine, that our conditions are in every way in fine shape at the present time. The real truth of the matter is that we are just beginning to approach our problems, that we are still far from the ideal, and that we wish only to be left alone in order that we might be able to fully solve these fundamental problems.

I wish in closing to quote a few words from a Spanish thinker: "Individual liberty has a tendency toward placing a man separate from his fellows, whereas fraternity, especially that which was preached by Christ, has a tendency to draw men together." We wish here in Mexico that this condition might be brought about, especially in regard to the relation of the two countries. We wish that the United States might be able to respect our liberty, our freedom, and, at the same time, that it might draw itself as closely as possible to Mexico on the basis of real fraternity. We want the Americans to come here and we will receive them with open arms provided they will respect our traditions, our history, our condition as free men. Thus we will receive them as friends and brothers. This is the only way in which the best welfare of the two countries may be assured, and is a better way than by sending aviators on long flights, than by Lindberghs, and by diplomatic efforts which do not go to the bottom of the problem. Harmony and understanding between the two peoples must come as the result of the touch of soul to soul, of spirit to spirit, of heart to heart. This understanding and harmony are the result of mutual understanding, based on truth and good-will.

I shall now close this talk with a few words from my former chief, one of the most talented men in Mexico, General Alvaro Obregón, which sums up what I have said in connection with this subject: "It is necessary to eliminate from the social conditions which

thoroughly dyed the Mexican family all of the vices and abuses established since the Conquest and which still create inhuman differences between the moneyed classes and the proletariat classes, until we can find an equilibrium which will permit the harmonious development of all the activities of this Mexican family."

Harmony is necessary in the internal relations of any country. Harmony and fraternity are necessary in the international relations between the two countries. A powerful country such as the United States needs to base its relations with weaker countries, countries which are considered weaker by the United States, on justice. In other words, we want the United States to respect us and then we will respect the United States and they can count upon our affection. We do not want the United States to treat us as it has treated Haiti and Nicaragua. If it does so, then the conditions of peace in this western hemisphere cannot be assured in any way or manner whatsoever. Clearer and stronger than the doctrine of the "Big Stick" of Roosevelt is the doctrine of brotherly love as preached by our Master, a doctrine which has not been accepted by civilized nations. I wish to close, then, hoping that this doctrine of fraternity and mutual respect may bring the two nations together, Mexico and the United States, for the good of both and for the good of mankind.

FRANK TANNENBAUM, *writer and penologist; author of "Wall Shadows," "Darker Phases of the South," "The Mexican Agrarian Revolution"; has made economic surveys of Mexico and Puerto Rico for the Institute of Economics, Washington, D. C.*

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEXICAN TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

FRANK TANNENBAUM

THOSE WHO know the history of the labor movement in Mexico recognize the tremendous difficulties in building labor unions in this country. If you know the history of the trade movement in our own country you know it involved tremendous sacrifice on the part of literally hundreds of people during the last fifty to seventy years. After all in the United States the worker has always had a certain right of self-assertion, a certain opportunity to be heard which did not exist in Mexico. Those who knew the Mexico of ten or fifteen years ago know that the workman had no voice, no rights, he was literally a slave. Because of the political set-up of Mexico at that time the mere getting together of a group was looked upon as a conspiracy, which Mexico dealt with shortly and in no uncertain manner. It took moral and physical courage to build up this movement in Mexico.

The human being is a curious animal. We insist that the world outside of us be just as it is inside of us. Fortunately, or unfortunately, it is not just that way. The world has a way of going on outside a little differently than we should like it. This leads many of us to be critical, sometimes captious, sometimes unfair, and often unintelligent, harping on what seem to be minor details. I am prepared to admit all the faults that might be found in the Mexican trade union move-

ment. In spite of that, the Mexican trade union movement, as such, seems to me to be one of the great conquests of the Mexican Revolution. The mere fact that in a country like Mexico men can sit down and work out a collective contract, sign it, and live up to it year after year, that in itself makes the Mexico of today a very different country from the Mexico before the Revolution.

It seems to me that the Mexican trade union movement is distinctive and significant as a Mexican phenomenon. Those of you who know Mexican history know this curious fact, that practically all of the Mexican political movements have centered around personality. The names of the movements have been an enlargement of the individual—Obregonistas, Zapatistas. When the leader was killed the movement disappeared. This is true of practically every movement of any historical significance in Mexico. It has been a personal matter to a great extent. It has been true in military affairs also. These movements have been built up by some strong personal element, which through force, intrigue, terror, has succeeded in welding followers together into a movement that persisted as long as the leader was there.

The interesting thing about the Mexican trade union movement is that it is not in any way a personal movement. It is true that some individuals like Mr. Morones have played important parts, but it is not a movement depending on any one individual. This is significant. Take great Mexican leaders like Santa Anna, Obregón, Calles, historically speaking and as a matter of record, at every crisis that came along these individual leaders were met by treason. Those who know Obregón's history know that on the day the Revolution broke out one of his best friends came and embraced him, offering him his services. Obregón gave him a division of his army. He marched out of the city and turned against Obregón. Over and over again we find cases of individual treason at every crisis.

A group of young men got together ten or fifteen years ago, Salcedo, Traviño, Morones and others—there were eighteen or twenty of them. Those people got together and through every crisis, even at the death of Obregon when it seemed as if every individual of any importance in the trade union movement would be destroyed, when every pressure was brought upon these individuals to turn against the

movement and force for themselves a place of prestige, not a single one turned traitor to the group. This is the first time in the history of the country that this happened. This movement went through crises as severe and bitter and dangerous as any other, but not one individual in that group turned against the movement. I want to distinguish the phenomenon of the Mexican trade union movement from other phenomena. It is not a personal development. If Mr. Morones were to die or be killed, the CROM as such would go on. This group has left behind an institution much larger and more enduring than any of the individuals involved. If you are concerned about the broader significance of the Mexican Revolution, about the by-products in terms of institutions left behind, that fact is of outstanding significance in the contemporary history of Mexico and for its future. The distinct fact about the Mexican trade union movement is that it is not a personal movement; that these people have built an organization bigger than an individual.

RICARDO TREVIÑO was one of the founders and formerly General Secretary of the Mexican Federation of Labor (the Confederación Regional Obrera Mexicana, or "Crom.")

THE MEXICAN LABOR MOVEMENT TODAY

RICARDO TREVIÑO

THE CROM is a federation of 1,200 local labor groups. These groups, of course, change from time to time. New groups come into being or old groups die and pass on. The CROM is in a continual state of flux, but maintains an approximate number of 1,200 local groups. Besides these the organization has sixty-six regional and state federations.

There are also six larger industrial federations. There are other labor organizations that are of great importance, but they are not yet affiliated with the CROM. The national railways, for example, have an organization of their own, but there are sections of the national railways which have certain allied trades that are within the CROM organization. Within the railway industry are what are called the section gangs, also the mechanics and carpenters. Those three groups have their own unions within the CROM but outside that, all the railway men form their own separate trade union. There is also another important organization outside the CROM made up of the electricians of the country, a national organization composed mostly of the men who work in the great electric plants. Most of the electricians who come to install electric equipment in homes, however, belong to the CROM.

There are also various other groups which have separated from the CROM for some reason or another, especially those radical groups such as the Socialists and Communists, and who do not form a national body, but are important and must be considered. There are about 60,000 workers on the railways; 40,000 belong to their own organization, 20,000 belong to the CROM. The number of electricians at work in the various electrical plants is only about 800. They form their own trade union. There are certain other groups, which cannot be named because of their heterogeneous nature, which are separated from the CROM. There are ten or twelve such groups whose number of membership we do not know.

It is also difficult to judge the number of Communistic groups. There are illustrations of their backing down when they have to face the music, such as Diego Rivera when he was on trial. He denied being a Communist, though everybody has regarded him as being one of the greatest examples of a Communist in this country.

Speaking ideally, there are three great divisions in Mexico in labor centers. First the CROM. The CROM is a determined effort on the part of the masses through their organization to substitute something better for the capitalistic system. The second group is the railway workers. These 40,000, who have no particular ideals, have not formulated any idealistic program of how to better their own conditions of labor. They want better hours, better wages, but within the capitalistic system.

The last group, the radical group, want to blow up the whole system and have a Utopia. The groups that have broken off from the CROM have exactly the same ideals and program as the CROM, with this distinction, that they do not have the leadership and are somewhat badly orientated. They are fighting the CROM because of some differences of opinion. They do not have the leadership, the drive or the prestige of the CROM. There is a unity of general policy among all these groups except the radical group. The other two large groups have unity of principle and get together to formulate general policies and make certain united demands in a large way on legislative bodies, working together in a certain sense, but, at the same time, they have their own particular organization and detailed program which they want to further. But, in general, the masses involved in the labor movement are going forward toward a goal that is more or less common.

The conflict that is most important in labor centers is the conflict that the CROM and other more conservative groups have had with the Communists. They have found that the Communists have been Mexico's worst enemy. In the first place, the Communistic group has been interested in ideals manufactured abroad, and whether those ideals suit Mexico or whether they destroy Mexico does not enter in. The propaganda has been directed largely against capital coming into this country, principally American capital, and they have not taken into consideration whether this has been good or bad for Mexico. They have been anti-nationalistic. Above all the labor movement stands for Mexico. Last year the Communistic group had the greatest opportunity of their history to put over a program. Many men in high places were Communists and the party was given much support. But in spite of these splendid opportunities the movement failed, and is now practically a corpse. We are not in favor of anything manufactured in Russia, especially since it does not fit our situation in Mexico. We are perfectly agreed that the Russians may live as they want to live and we will respect the Communistic system of Russia and will let them live as they want and will do nothing to destroy their ideals. But we do not want the Russians to come here and implant propaganda which will destroy the Mexican way of living—we do not want them to plant, in our soil, things which are not indigenous to Mexico.

There are two organizations within the life of the masses, one social, one political. One has for its objectives the dealing with questions of labor, the relation of employé to employer. It finds its activities in various trade unions. On the other hand, there is the political labor party, which does not have politics as its end, but arises from the exigencies of the circumstances of the day. It has as its purpose the voicing of labor aspirations and is attempting to put labor leaders into political positions so that they might give voice to labor. It is not an end, but a means of bettering the conditions of the laboring people.

*FREDERIC SIEDENBURG, clergyman, educator and sociologist,
is dean of the School of Sociology, Loyola University.*

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

REV. FREDERIC SIEDENBURG

ANYONE familiar with labor conditions in the United States would employ the word status and eliminate the word movement, because labor is to a great extent static today, and the movement is principally that of men and women seeking jobs. However, a consideration of the entire labor situation presupposes ultimate normal conditions with a hope that our present unemployment problem will receive consideration that will prevent its repetition. Our Congress is now concerned about several unemployment laws, but they are prospective laws concerning only better labor statistics and a Federal employment bureau.

The fact that today in the United States not more than 4,000,000 out of 27,000,000 wage earners are organized is proof that in many fields of labor wages are low and conditions unfavorable, and that there is room and opportunity for education, propaganda and legislation to improve labor conditions throughout the country. Some states like Wisconsin, Ohio and New York are more progressive than others, and have in the past been leaders in reform and progress, but the United States has trailed most European countries in betterment laws, and what we have are primarily due to organized labor, women's clubs, social workers, and the desire of politicians for the labor vote.

The story of labor from the Industrial Revolution in England and the first factories in the United States is one of slow progress and one in which industry and capital have always been leagues ahead of the law and labor. Nevertheless, in spite of our great natural resources and the American individualistic character, the lot of the laborer has improved until today his standard of living is the highest the world has ever known, one in which luxuries of the past decade are the necessities of this. Today workmen's compensation acts and laws regulating factories and hours of labor are current in almost all states, but we have made little or no progress with social insurances as they affect sickness, unemployment, old age and death.

The recent unemployment period intensified by the increased mechanization of industry has made it almost impossible for men and women to obtain new jobs, and has brought to the fore our serious problem of dependent old men and women. Recently I heard of a case of some girls about 25 years old who were discharged on account of "old age." New machinery was introduced that required little or no skill, but it was found that 18-year-old girls were cheaper and just as efficient.

The poor-farm and almshouses are no solution to this evil—a fact that is gradually dawning upon us, for ten states have already passed some form of old age pensions, while others have appointed commissions to study the problem. Today, 1,000,000 people in the United States over 65 years of age are dependent on public and private charity, and the problem is a pressing one.

It is hard to reconcile the fact that the United States—by far the

richest country in the world—is yet so indifferent to the fate of its dependent old men and women, mostly derelicts of the very industries that made the nation rich. Shall we, with China and India, alone disregard our aged poor, who have helped to better our industries? Many of them who were once our captains of industry, finance, and invention—a Siegal, a Buick—have come to charity in their old age.

Due to better management and machinery, the American wage earner is today producing nearly three-fifths more than he did thirty years ago, and recently Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, declared that the yearly output of the American worker is fifty-two hundred dollars, as compared with the fifteen hundred dollars of European workers. Other statistics show that capital and not the laborer receive the benefit of this high efficiency and that many industries do not pay even a living wage. It would seem that the higher technique of modern industry not only reduces the wages of the earner, but jeopardizes his job.

Will our industrial efficiency approximate the robot of the dramatist, and what then? It has been said that the United States Patent Office has suppressed many patents, because if used they would cause a revolution of unemployment.

The economic background of unemployment and old-age dependency is the overproduction of goods and the excessive capacity of plants and personnel. The implied inefficiency of this is known to employers, and has been well characterized by Stuart Chase in his book, "The Tragedy of Waste."

The National Industrial Conference Board reported that in 1927, one thousand corporations maintained research laboratories, and that two hundred million dollars were spent for industrial research by federal and private corporations, not counting the contributions of universities and technical colleges. The Federal Department of Agriculture has revolutionized farming methods, and research and experiments will aid somewhat in the field of industry. Let us hope that this revolution will not mean loss of work, and low pay, but rather a shorter labor day and week, a month's vacation, and the necessary education so that the masses may profit by the newly won leisure to gain a higher culture and better living.

This is the trend of the modern labor movement, and its economic

necessity will ignore Sherman Acts and trust-busters, so that the mergers will take the place of monopolies; duplication of plants and personnel will be eliminated, and the chain store will drive the middleman out of the picture. The rural worker is also a factor in the new labor movement, for the Farm Bureau has turned agriculture into a large coöperative, and the farmer is not only reimbursed by national resources but is also subject to national control. Here is the real movement of American labor in the factory and on the farm, obscured under the seeming static of unemployment and depression.

Will labor, urban and rural, stop there, or will our present movement be a prelude to more consolidation and governmental control? Will the virtual monopoly of telegraph and telephones become like the actual monopoly of the post office? We have an Interstate Commerce Commission and Farm Board. Will we have an Interstate Industrial Commission and Mining Board? Considering the American character and the American conditions, the process will be by evolution, and not revolution, and we may well ask, will it evolve into collective ownership or into an attempt like the chaotic experiment of Russia?

As history goes, the capital system is recent and will no doubt give way to new concepts and new processes. But whatever may be our future economic order, it must square with the dignity of man, emphasizing that he is not an industrial machine, but a personality, a spiritual entity, infinitely higher than matter, whether it be mud or gold. Industry, commerce and agriculture must remember that back of their labor is man—for whom they exist and without whom they have no meaning. The enormous system of the future must prefer the rights of man to those of property, because wealth was created for man, and not man for it. This is the paramount principle which the modern mind will demand, a principle expressed by our fathers as the right of liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It means for every son of Adam the right to work, an opportunity for health, education and recreation; a minimum standard of living, in other words, "frugal comfort" as Leo XIII said. This is the modern estate and destiny of man, and towards it the labor of the future must move.

In the past American labor has been influenced by our enormous natural resources, the influx of the immigrant, and the individualistic

character of our people. In the future it must be conditioned by a scientific application of economic laws expressed in social legislation and public opinion. It may be reinforced by the introduction of the handicraft labor of other days and by substituting social service for competitive greed. Employer and employé need learn the dictum of the Master, "Man shall not live by bread alone," before we usher in a better age!

VIII
SOCIAL PROBLEMS

*RAFAEL RAMÍREZ is chief of the Department of Rural Education
under the Ministry of Public Education of Mexico.*

THE ANTI-ALCOHOLIC CAMPAIGN

RAFAEL RAMÍREZ

YOU HAVE asked that I come to tell what we are doing to combat alcoholism in Mexico. With very real pleasure I am going to comply with your very justifiable wishes, but I beg to state that this will not be exactly a lecture. Rather we will deal with a simple gathering of facts and data to the end that you may form an opinion in regard to the crusade against alcoholism which we have organized and are carrying on. My talk this morning will consist, then, of a series of quotations of recognized authority which describe and portray a situation which it was necessary to transform; of a concise account of the way and the form in which we are carrying on the campaign; of a succinct exposition of some of the most satisfactory immediate results and of a few words in which we reiterate our faith in the peasant and working classes and our hope in their definite redemption.

The social Revolution in Mexico which began in 1910 has not yet ended. A terrible and formidable enemy of the people is still in action. It is alcoholism.

Wherever one may go in the country he always encounters its advance forces and back of them its organized battalions in full sway, destroying the welfare of the peasant and working people, destroying their health, degenerating their offspring and putting out in their souls the light of the hope of redemption.

Listen!

In the north of the country within the vast state of Chihuahua the indigenous race of the Tarahumaras occupies a large region. Basauri, who has studied them says: "The Tarahumara lives in perfectly

wretched conditions, suffers chronic hunger and clearly has entered the stage of physiological decadence. It is no wonder then that he takes recourse to alcohol which stimulates him and gives him at least momentarily an illusion of well-being, strength and pleasure. The beverage with which they are wont to become intoxicated is *tesguino*, a product of fermented corn which contains an average of ten per cent of alcohol. The intoxication produced by *tesguino* is similar in its clinical aspect to that produced by beer. As to acute alcoholic intoxication repeated periodically, it may be said that the practice is general in both sexes and all ages. Mothers give *tesguino* to their children in early infancy believing that in that way they stimulate their growth and strengthen their constitution. Without doubt the intoxication produced by *tesguino* is a principal factor in the high infant mortality among the Tarahumaras. Of every ten children which are born barely two survive. Their drinking parties which last several consecutive days are organized on any pretext whatever. The birth of a child, the death of a person, the termination of planting or of harvesting, and so on, are sufficient excuse for giving themselves over to the wildest drinking which lasts, as has been said, several consecutive days. In this condition men and women in the most dreadful promiscuity are indifferent to adultery, incest, violation. . . ."

This is in the north. Let us see how it is in the south. A supervisor of rural education whose field of activity is the state of Oaxaca said to me a short time ago, "There, traditionally, in each of the communities are celebrated periodically festivals both large and small to which residents of other nearby villages come. Vendors come to them for the purpose of selling their wares, especially beer, wine, and the *mexcal*. The smaller festivals last one day or, at most, two. The so called *fiestas grandes* last sometimes a whole week. These festivals turn into real orgies. The stands for the sale of intoxicating liquors are replete with drunken people; in the streets, stretched on the ground, are men in a completely unconscious condition of intoxication; those on the verge of losing consciousness stagger along with heavy step. When the festival is over the poor Indians set out for their villages without a single cent and without a single one of the articles they had intended to buy."

In the central part of the country the situation is similar. A district

supervisor in the mountains of the state of Puebla wrote me a short time ago, "Alcoholism is a deeply rooted vice in the mass of the indigenous people who inhabit this region. There is no ceremony, official, social or religious, in which a copious quantity of alcohol is not drunk by men, women and even children. Thus, for instance, upon the occasion of the installation of local authorities, or a civic festival or merely of a judicial or administrative investigation the people soak themselves with drink. In religious festivals not only the residents of the place drink to intoxication but the people of nearby villages come there for the sole purpose of drinking abundantly, so that it may be said that the religious motives are a secondary matter; or rather that they serve as a pretext for getting drunk. Upon the birth of a child the parents, relatives and friends get drunk; when a child is baptized these disgraceful scenes are repeated; upon the marriage of a son or daughter the greater part of those present get drunk; when a member of the family dies the remaining friends and relatives drown their grief in alcohol. And yet more, during the festival of All Saints, the principal festival among the Indians of these parts, the people drink and drink in memory of the dead. What wonder is it that these poor people have an abject and wretched life? . . ."

Speaking of another part of the same state, Puebla, the district supervisor of this region tells me the following: "The success which has been obtained in the alcoholic crusade in which I have urged my teachers to endeavor is almost imperceptible here, for unfortunately in the villages of this region all are hardened addicts, from the authorities to the poorest and most wretched peasant. The authorities are the owners of saloons and the political leaders get rich from their stands for the sale of intoxicating liquors. In Chietla, the Government Treasury agent is the person who does the most business in alcoholic beverages. . . ."

From all parts of the country day after day the same disheartening reports reach me. This from Sonora: "The anti-alcoholic campaign goes to wreck upon the rocky resistance of those who sustain the vice, some of whom are local government employees who support and conceal clandestine traffic; and as this complicity is very lucrative they annoy the teachers and intrigue against them. . . ." From Veracruz: "In spite of the dry law decreed in that state the people get drunk

morning, noon and night, ruining themselves and their offspring to the fifth generation. . . ." From Chiapas: "The Chamulas and other Indian people of the region become more sodden in drink day by day, for the traffic in intoxicating drinks is thoroughly organized there, so that evidently it has, if not the support, at least the open tolerance of the authorities." In the central part of the country I myself see that *pulque* is a plague, wide and deep, which besots and degenerates the peasants and workers.

Why go on? The panorama is sad and discouraging. Gazing upon it in its full extent and all its detail one needs to have much heart not to lose faith in the future. All the teachers of Mexico already have a deep and absolute faith in a glorious future for our race; but we felt ourselves refortified when at the beginning of last year the chief of our Nation with encouraging words gave us another lead and showed us the way to another undertaking of great import. He said to us at that time: "One of the deepest convictions which should sway the followers of the Revolution is that among the great enemies of the race and of the future of Mexico we should point out the vice of alcoholism, deeply rooted in the great part of our peasant and working classes. We cannot think of dignifying the home and the working people of Mexico while alcoholism undermines the physical and spiritual forces of our men, destroys marital happiness and nullifies with degenerated children every possibility of greatness in the future of our country.

"For these solemn considerations I feel called upon to utter a summons to all moral forces in the country to organize and undertake a vigorous and relentless campaign against so terrible a vice. As good followers of the Revolution we should adopt a firm resolution to combat by all possible means this enemy of the welfare, the health and the hope of redemption of the Mexican peasant and worker. No instrument of the slavery of the people has lent more aid to masters and to the exploiters of human toil than alcoholism. To dominate the human soul it is necessary to break down the spirit and the dignity of man; for this reason alcoholism is the powerful ally of all tyrannies and all iniquitous exploitations. The Revolution has tried to establish liberty, responsibility and the dignification of the people through work. To do so it has had to combat powerful enemies; but alcoholism is

still on the field as the implacable destroyer of the character and the virtues of the race.

"I appeal therefore to local and state governments, to agrarian communities, to workers' organizations, to leagues of parents, to mutual benefit societies, to political parties and to other institutions and persons who may be willing to collaborate in this undertaking to the end that they proceed at once to organize the most energetic campaign in their respective entities as an unmistakable proof that they know how to rise to an intelligent comprehension of our national problems. I know by experience that these institutions and individuals conscious of their moral power and of their civic functions and duties are irresistible, moved by the high purpose of the redemption of our working classes to destroy the vice of alcoholism. I appeal also to mothers' organizations and to women's organizations in general. It is women who suffer the saddest and most deplorable consequences of this vice which ruins the home. By the same token, women must be, as they have been in other countries and in other parts of our country, the strongest and surest ally in the whole campaign against alcoholism."

These were the words of our President Portes Gil; and we directed our schools upon the way which was laid out. We transmitted the order; and all the teachers, like disciplined officers organized the combat and gave battle, forgetting no front. The following will give you an idea of the action:

- 1.—Introducing into the schools a new subject which they called "lessons in anti-alcoholism." This subject was taught both in the day classes for the children and in the evening classes for the adults. I omit the program because I am sure you can imagine what topics it comprised.

- 2.—The reading lessons were frequently taken advantage of to read and explain material with reference to the campaign.

- 3.—In the composition and writing lessons the teacher held contests for making up and writing posters to be put in the most frequented public places and at the cross-ways of the most traveled roads.

- 4.—In arithmetic the statistics of alcoholic production, consumption and mortality were studied.

- 5.—In the hygiene class the disastrous effects of alcohol upon dif-

ferent organs of the body were studied and written down, and also the things which we should not drink and those which it is well to drink.

6.—In the drawing lessons, posters were made representing the life of alcohol addicts.

7.—In the morning assembly-period the teachers frequently spoke, deploring the terrible vice.

8.—In the programs in social gatherings organized by the school there was always a number designed to combat alcoholism.

9.—All the schools instituted a weekly anti-alcoholic hour both for the children and for the adults designed to study and to discuss the theme.

10.—On Sundays the reading hour was and is being used by the teachers to read and explain the propaganda against alcoholism which the Departments of Public Health and of Rural Schools constantly distribute in abundant quantity.

But as our rural teachers have real initiative they direct their action in different ways. They attack the enemy on the fore, on the flank and on the rear. They have sometimes constructed their open air theaters and now they are using them not only for the recreation of the people of the villages but also to transmit moral betterment campaigns by means of plays. Their dramatic presentations related to the struggle against alcoholism are forceful and persuasive. Out there in a little community I have seen a play with this title, "A Mother's Calvary, or The Fruits of Alcoholism." In another community I saw a play entitled, "Health and Riches," with an entirely anti-alcoholic context. And if it is true that these plays are not constructive within all the canons of the art and that at times they reveal a crude technique, nevertheless their texture is taken from the very life of the little villages and the impression upon the spectators is forceful and intense. With my own eyes last year I saw the calm Dr. Marvin Pittman, distinguished teacher from Michigan State Normal College greatly moved as he witnessed one of these crude and simple plays in a little school hidden among the brush in Actopan. Yes, we have discovered in the theater one of the best means of drawing the people away from the stands for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

And every rural school has its playground. The games which are

promulgated there give strength to the body and recreation to the spirit. Saturday afternoons, Sundays and festival days children, young people and adults gather there seeking wholesome recreation. Apropos of the efficacy of this, a woman district-supervisor in Coahuila wrote me: "I have heard the comments of this simple rustic people. They said, 'How good this is! In this way we forget many temptations and forgetting them frequently we will get rid of them for good.'" And a district-supervisor in Guerrero has just written me concerning the same point: "Only a few months ago on Sunday afternoons the saloons of the communities were full of drunken peasants. Today at these very same hours the saloons are empty and the playground is inadequate to hold, on one hand the number of players, young and old, and on the other hand the spectators of all ages who come to enjoy the wholesome and beautiful spectacle."

Then, too, in every community festival of social, religious or civic nature the rural teachers make the most of the situation, and at an opportune moment mount a chair or a box and talk to the crowd, addressing themselves both to their minds and feelings with the purpose of drawing them away from the abyss.

While they do all this, the rural teachers still further find time and means to organize their neighborhoods and enlist them in the new struggle. There is not a settlement in the country, however small, in which there is a rural school, but that an anti-alcoholic committee, made up of influential members of the little community, is actively at work. Their program of action is definite and wide, and the endeavor of these committees is efficacious and satisfactory.

Furthermore, the social influence of the teachers does not end here. They tactfully get in touch with other organizations which have been formed in many communities with other objects and through suggestions succeed in enlarging their programs with the addition of an anti-alcoholic section.

The idea has taken hold and is spreading with appreciable strength. There are communities in which "every one feels under obligation to enlist in this redeeming crusade," according to the words of an enthusiastic teacher in Jalisco.

Indication of the irresistibility of the trend is the fact that even the authorities with influence in the life of the little settlements are

augmenting, little by little, the ranks of our battalions, suppressing the stands for the sale of intoxicating drinks, fiercely combating clandestine traffic, or at least regulating sale of alcoholic drinks in a form which may be considered as a step in advance. It is true that in this chapter much is yet to be accomplished, because to the authorities themselves it is a matter of concern that things continue in *statu quo*, for the traffic in alcohol signifies an appreciable source of income for the official treasuries. But if it is true that there is much yet to be done it is also true that the rural teachers have undertaken the task. A work to which the rural teachers in Mexico set their hands is a work carried to a conclusion. I have information that in a district in Michoacán in which the teachers have worked ardently and in which their influence has been decisive the extirpation of alcoholic drinks has been accomplished. The authorities there have allied themselves frankly and sincerely with the campaign.

One of the most gratifying things is to see how our humble rural teachers have not only intelligence but also the daring to undermine a most tenacious opposition. Speaking with me the other day in the Department of Education one of these lovable teachers from the state of Puebla said, "Will you believe, professor, that in our region the priests are beginning to use the pulpit to support our campaign? And how well they do it, and how efficacious their sermons are!" This is a great deal gained. The clergy is enlisting together with us in the cause of the redemption of the people, the clergy which barely yesterday was the greatest and most formidable ally of the class which exploited the poor and the humble.

This was our situation in September of last year. At the beginning of October the President of the Republic thought well to address to the children of Mexico the following suggestive message:

"The 20th of November, anniversary of our Revolution, should be commemorated by the new generations, for this date marks, since 1910, the program of the resurrection and liberation of the conscience of the people of Mexico.

"The children of the schools of the Republic should reverence the heroes, the martyrs, those who in the tragic days of the Revolution fell to redeem men from all oppressions. And no oppression is more

terrible than the vice of alcoholism, bringer of misery, degeneration and shame.

"The wretched victims of alcoholism fill the prisons, the hospitals and the insane asylums. Generally the hand of the criminal is moved by alcohol. Noble Mexican women who guide your steps and watch over your slumber have suffered cruel bitterness, poverty and violence because of alcohol which degrades men to the point of forgetting their duties and their affections. Especially the humble homes suffer the last of this terrible ill; because they have not sufficient reserve to withstand days of sickness, prison-sentence or unemployment, hunger and ruin come upon the humble family.

"The children should take advantage of the great 20th of November, glorious anniversary of our Mexican Revolution, to rise in a unanimous manifestation in the whole country begging their elders and their parents to become fervent allies in the battle against alcohol. Children, with the potency of their innocent hearts, and because their destiny rests with their parents have a right to ask of them the example of sobriety and the forceful lesson of combating by their own conduct the horrors of alcoholism. No malediction can more deeply touch the spirits of parents than that which springs from the pure and innocent lips of their children. The childish voices of this manifestation surely will represent in the conscience of the heads of families the legions of children who through alcoholic degeneracy, their cursed inheritance, are destined to become flesh of pain and crime; they will represent the homes in which good Mexican women have over and over again seen sacrificed their happiness which should be protected by the dignity, the toil and the honor of men, and will represent, last of all, the voice of our heroes and martyrs who have dreamed of a country strong of bodily fiber and of spirit.

"Children of the Republic, the 20th of November is a day when you can say to your parents, 'If you wish us to be good, strong and useful, teach us by your example.'

"Confident that these sentiments will be shared by the children of all the schools in the country I utter a solemn convocation that on this day, and at twelve o'clock noon, you make manifestation clamorously, ardently and impressively, organized by your own teachers and carrying standards and posters and by all other means of propaganda

demonstrating your sincere malediction against alcoholism and your fervent desire that your fathers and all the men of Mexico become convinced and active allies in this patriotic campaign against the enemy of the working classes and the future greatness of our country."

The anti-alcoholic manifestation which the President of the Republic had suggested for the 20th of November was carried out last year with unmistakable and redounding success. We did not need to give many instructions to our teachers for we believed that the message of the President transcribed above was sufficiently explicit. The following is all that we did:

- 1.—We sent, by way of suggestion, a good collection of slogans to be used in posters and banners on the day of the manifestation.

- 2.—We suggested a drawing contest related to the anti-alcoholic campaign. With the best of the drawings the teachers were to prepare an exhibit in the most frequented public place of the community.

- 3.—We indicated that it would be desirable for the children to prepare a short and simple oath to be pronounced by way of a firm resolution upon the day of the manifestation as one number of the program.

- 4.—We ordained that all the anti-alcoholic committees and all the organizations of men and women who directly or indirectly have been working in favor of the campaign should take active part in this manifestation.

- 5.—That it would be well that the children, availing themselves of the language lesson, should make up and write a letter of request to be delivered the 20th of November to their fathers or members of the family who use alcohol, or make abuse of it, begging them to abstain in the future for the good of themselves, their homes and society in general.

We said not another word to the teachers. Without desisting from the general campaign they all set to work to organize the demonstration. When the day came it was carried out at the same hour throughout the whole country. It had grandeur and solemnity.

I keep as a pleasant remembrance of this demonstration a little button to fasten upon one's coat; which bears the following inscription, "Don't drink, papa dear." A little boy from the far-away territory of Lower California sent it to me, and in his little letter he said, "All

we children wore this button on our blouses in the demonstration."

Since then we have kept on working with redoubled faith and increased enthusiasm. President Ortiz Rubio as well as the Secretary of Education, Licenciado don Aarón Sáenz, have encouraged and stimulated us to carry on the task. Greatly heartened we go on with the struggle.

We are happy with the results obtained in the first eighteen months of the campaign. We know of many regions of the country in which the anti-alcoholic idea has taken definite hold. It is quite usual to find in the reports of the district supervisors information like the following: "The anti-alcoholic endeavor in my district which I myself did not believe would have any effect is bearing fruit." Three days ago one of the inspectors, talking with me in my office, said to me, "I hesitate to tell you of the results obtained up to the present in relation to the anti-alcoholic campaign in the district in which I am. If I were to do so, perhaps you would not believe me. However, I believe I should tell you that we are making remarkable progress. We are bound to triumph, and that soon."

I say to you what that district supervisor said to me: "We are bound to triumph!" I have complete faith in a positive success; I have faith in the persistent and intelligent endeavor of our teachers; I have faith in the goodness of the human material with which we are working.

JOSÉ ALMARAZ, a lawyer and an authority on penal law, is the author of the new penal code of Mexico. He is the president of the Supreme Council of Protection and Prevention under which the new law functions.

NEW PENAL LEGISLATION IN MEXICO

JOSÉ ALMARAZ

PENAL legislation is entrusted with the protection of those very interests which are by nature most susceptible of violation, namely, the life, property and honor of the collectively organized groups which constitute the state, the groups of individuals, and the individuals themselves. Penal legislation would not exist if every man respected the needs of his neighbor; if no man violated the rights of another. But the passions, the uncontrolled exuberance of life, or the organic defects—whether acquired or congenital—of the individual, often deprive him of the power to restrain himself from practicing harmful acts or to resist the temptations of evil. Hence the need for the state to combat evil with legal restrictions which are civil decrees, in the so-called civil law; and penal decrees in the penal law. While civil legislation regulates (defines, permits and facilitates) contracts, offering forms freely and officially, penal legislation decrees against (defines, prohibits and obstructs) the practice of crime, imposing penalties necessarily and officially. It has been said that society cannot defend itself against crime, except through the instrument of punishment. Society has therefore a practical means of protection, the effectiveness of which must be revealed in a reduction of *delinquency*. Have the legal codes thus far enforced achieved this purpose?

The old code which has recently been replaced by the one now in force was based on the principles of the classical school, according to

which all men were endowed with the same ideas of good and evil, of justice and injustice; and all were therefore subject to the same moral law. If a man practiced evil while it was in his power to practice good, he infringed upon this moral law; he was responsible for his act and must suffer a penalty because he was at fault. This penalty had an expiatory character. The individual must be punished *because he had sinned*. If the offence were breach of law, the classicists affirmed that it was a judicial matter, and on this basis they constructed a majestic edifice of syllogisms, which attained its completion in the last century, when Carrara, the famous teacher of Piza, published his *Program*. Presupposing free will and intelligence to be the principle of responsibility, he was led to consider as irresponsible all lunatics, minors and other beings who lacked the will or intelligence, and to regard as only partly responsible those who only partly possessed these faculties. Granting these premises, the system could not have been better from a logical standpoint, but—it did not correspond to reality. Carrara studied the act and the offence, but failed to fathom the subject, the offender. He accepted the average man as a reality, whereas such a being is only theoretical and does not exist. Just as there is no such thing as an average horse, so the man does not exist who is average, well balanced, diligent, careful and reflective. But if he did exist, the average man would be a hybrid of the emotional, the violent, the apathetic, the self-indulgent, the nervous, the imbecile, the timid and the bloodthirsty types,—indeed he would be a monstrosity, and far removed from the ideal of the classicists.

The old code administered only one order of punishments and its problem was to apply such punishments *quantitatively* according to the seriousness of the offense, which was considered from an abstract point of view and according to the degree of responsibility, that is to say, the free will and intelligence of the agent at the time he committed the offense.

If, while writing these words, I am ignorant of what I owe to myself and to others; of what I owe to my reading, my education and my environment, how is it possible for a stranger to come any closer to the truth of these matters? How is it possible for a judge to discover and appraise the amount of free will and intelligence that a criminal possessed at the *moment* when he committed the crime? When pen-

alties are meted out blindly; when punishments of one variety are prescribed for an infinite variety of individuals; when offenders of all kinds are thrown together into the prisons; when all of them—young and old, normal and abnormal—are subjected to the same prison régime, is it any wonder that these places of detention should prove to be the best schools of delinquency, in which the occasional offender loses the last vestiges of self-respect and integrity and whence the confirmed criminals shoot their poisoned arrows into the heart of society? It is not at all strange that reality—which dissipates not a few dreams and destroys many an illusion—should have taken it upon itself to prove, with the cruelty of figures, the bankruptcy of the statutes which were based on the classic principles above expounded. Indeed, statistics—that thermometer which registers the disturbances of society—have revealed that, contrary to expectations, there has been an appalling increase in crime *in all the countries of the world*; that there has been a great deal of relapse into crime among first offenders and that recurrent offences have taken place during the earlier years of the life of the delinquent and shortly after the fulfillment of the prison term. In other words, statistics apparently reveal that, far from reducing the amount of crime, the classic system of punishment actually tends to incite and foster its growth. Delinquency is growing to an alarming degree, notwithstanding the progress of civilization and the refinement—more ostensible than real—of social customs. . . .

II

Among the innovations put into practice by the new code, the first in order of importance is the doctrine on which it is based: that of *social defense*. Society has the right to defend itself against its outside enemies (rival nations) and against its inside enemies (delinquents). The individual who infringes upon the moral law is not subjected to a penalty or punishment *because he has sinned* (expiation, revenge). Rather, he is subjected to a corrective régime which will convert him from a social liability into a social asset, or, in certain cases, he will be done away with. The offender is dealt with by law not because *he has sinned*, but in order that *he may not sin again*. The new code is preventive rather than repressive. The responsibility does

not exist because the individual possesses a free will and intelligence, but because his acts reveal that he is a *permanent* social menace, that he lacks principles or power of inhibition and will continue behaving in a way which is harmful to the social group in which he lives. If the lunatic, the drug addict, the degenerate and the minor were not liable under the classic code because they were not in full possession of their free will and intelligence, under the new code they are liable because they are found to be in a dangerous condition, which justifies the intervention of the law. It does not matter much whether the thief is a criminal or a kleptomaniac: the important thing to me is that I be guaranteed the safety of my property and that the transgressor be prevented from continuing to harm me and my neighbors. This, then, is the policy of the new penal legislation: that any individual who gives evidence of being in a condition that is dangerous to society shall be dealt with by law for the purpose of protecting society, that is to say, he will be subjected to a corrective régime in keeping with the degree of social menace which he may constitute, in order that he may be transformed into a useful social factor, and so that the menace may be eliminated.

III

The principal measures adopted to this end are the following:

First: To study the delinquent primarily for the sake of ascertaining the extent of his danger to society. For this purpose, every time a crime is reported, the Legal Police are obliged to collect all the data that may bear out the fact of the crime, and, more particularly, all possible information that may help in *understanding* the delinquency of the criminal. A further study of the offender is then made before the judge, with the aid of experts.

The policy of individual attention is carried still further when the Supreme Board for Social Protection and Prevention of Crime makes its own study of the case, and, on the basis of the character of the delinquent, determines the treatment most appropriate to the case and the place in which the treatment shall be administered.

The Board carefully observes the results obtained by the régime adopted in each case and grants freedom (preparatory or final) not necessarily on the last day of the confinement term fixed by the

judge, but from the moment when the desired results have been accomplished and when it is, therefore, no longer necessary to continue the régime in question.

Second: The foregoing entails the adoption of a system of *relative sentences*, since the reformed delinquent is granted his freedom after he has served one-third of the time set by the judge, or, in the other extreme after he has exceeded that period of time by 50 per cent.

The policy of individual attention is also borne out in the variety of penalties or prescribed régimes under the new code, in contrast with the system followed by the old code, wherein the only difference between one penalty and another consisted of a difference in length of time. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon this fallacy of the old code. How is it possible to eliminate the social menace represented by a drunkard, a drug addict or a mental defective, merely by confining the individual to a prison for a period of time fixed beforehand by a judge? On the other hand, is it sensible to attempt to cure one of these individuals by compelling him to pay a pecuniary penalty? Common sense points to the other method, which is to submit the criminal to a corrective régime which will last just as long as may be necessary in order to effect his cure. The attitude adopted by the penal code now in force is the following: drunkards, drug addicts, mental defectives and lunatics, who represent a permanent menace to society, are interned in institutions according to the nature of their ailments. They are subjected to special treatment and set free just as soon as their cure is effected. In the case of minors—who are frequently in a permanent state of danger,—when they commit an offence or are found to be morally abandoned, they are studied by special courts and examined without any of the severity or solemnity which attends the trial of an adult. The causes of their abandonment or delinquency are inquired into and they are interned in schools, farms, work-shops or reformatories until they are cured or until their energies have found a proper outlet and their characters have been shaped; or, until, on becoming of age, they acquire a trade or profession which will permit them to lead an honest life and to resist the temptations of evil.

Recurrent offenders, who are the quintessence of the criminal menace, are almost all incorrigible and, for the protection of society, it is useless to deal with them except in a final way. For this class

of delinquency the classic code decrees confinement of the longest duration, which must be fulfilled in isolated places (Marias Islands).

Third: The penalty of fine has been applied in all countries and up to this time, in a blind, unjust and unjudicial manner. As a matter of fact, the penalty of fine was applied indiscriminately for offenses of all natures. If law-breaking is due to numerous causes, and if there are various kinds of crime which correspond to organic or abnormal degenerations of a moral or social character, it is unquestionable that neither fines nor imprisonment can offer a panacea for our criminal ills. For example, how is it possible to fight against the practice of swindling, by imposing on the swindler a fine which cannot exceed one-quarter of the amount involved? Under this clause of the old code, the man who swindled to the extent of \$100,000.00 had but to pay \$25,000.00, and, in extreme cases, to fulfill a prison term, upon the completion of which he would return to society to enjoy in peace and security the remaining \$75,000.00. Such legal measures only served to foster this order of crime.

The penalty of fine must be a legal measure which will oppose or work against the development of an evil passion or tendency: cupidity or covetousness. Therefore, the new code applies the penalty of fine to thieves, swindlers and all other delinquents in whom the instinct of cupidity predominates. And its quantitative application depends upon the amount stolen or swindled, but always in a manner that will convince the delinquent of the futility of his acts, as far as results are concerned, and which will wound him precisely in his most vulnerable spot: his possessions. If a man obtains \$10,000.00 by theft or swindle and is compelled to return the \$10,000.00 plus a further and like sum, which he has earned by the sweat of his brow, it is logical to hope that the number of recurrences will be much smaller than it was under the abolished code. This is the reason that the penalty of fine was unjudicial and ineffective as a means to fight against delinquency.

Furthermore, this method of punishment was unjust. It was believed possible to attain a maximum of fairness by establishing as the amount of the fine a set sum in ordinary currency, as, for instance, \$50.00; but it was forgotten that equality consists precisely of applying unequal measures. If John and Peter committed the same offence under like circumstances, and the judge fined each the amount

of, say, \$50.00, an injustice was incurred. If John earned \$5.00 daily and Peter \$100.00, by fining each alike \$50.00, their earnings were taxed in the following proportion: $10 X : \frac{X}{2}$, X representing the daily salary or allowance taxed.

This is the reason that the code now in use follows the system of the writer, which consists of expressing the fine, not in money, but in *working days*. Once the judge ascertains the daily earning power of the offender, it is a simple matter to make the conversion into money; and the term *working days* is a common factor applicable to all delinquents, although the amount of money involved may vary with each individual.

Another of the innovations consists of endeavoring to realize the pecuniary penalty. The offender may not possess at the given moment the amount corresponding to the fine; but because he has to furnish sufficient guarantee or accomplish the work assigned to him by the Supreme Board, he always makes good the fine which he has been condemned to pay.

IV

Up to a short time ago, all offenders sentenced to serve prison terms were thrown pell-mell into unsanitary prisons and consigned to a lazy and vicious life. Only in a few exceptional instances were they put to work, but in such cases their salaries were arbitrarily fixed by the heads of the respective institutions and were so small as to lack any significance whatever. Many were the cases in which sluggards and tramps committed deliberate offenses in order to be put into prison, where they could obtain free board and lodging and communicate with their comrades for the purpose of hatching new plots or supplying them with harmful drugs. The authors of the new penal legislation have understood that it is unfair to burden honest people with the maintenance of delinquents, of whom they have been the victims. They have also realized that it is senseless to maintain the best schools for criminals and to pretend to fight against delinquency with such archaic and aimless methods as those recently followed. The government has finally decided to establish as a general principle that delinquents shall be reformed by means of work. Such work

shall be chosen according to the aptitudes of the individual, who will receive an equitable fixed salary, which which he shall pay for his board and clothing and for the damage he has incurred; so that whoever does not work does not eat. Society is not obliged to maintain sluggards and tramps,—even if they are criminals. The latter must work in order to comply with the obligations inherent in their responsibility, and to obtain a *modus vivendi* which will lead them away from the criminal path and will convert them from parasites into productive social factors.

The organization of work is also of decisive importance in the treatment of lunatics, mental weaklings, drunkards, drug addicts and minors. The place of confinement varies according to the particular condition of each delinquent (lunatic asylums, sanatoriums, farms, workshops or training ships) but in all cases the system is based on the régime of work.

V

Caution and experience have counselled the adoption of the so-called *suspended sentence*, whereby it is permissible to suspend the enforcement of a term of imprisonment imposed by irrevocable decree, provided certain requisites are complied with.

When it is the individual's first offense; when, up to that time, he has observed good conduct, which can be proved with positive facts; when he has an honest means of subsistence and can offer a guarantee that he will appear before the judge and repair the damage he has caused; then, the enforcement of the sentence is suspended. The reason for adopting this course is that offenders of this nature are presumed to be uncommon and are believed to be capable of refraining from further offenses, and of directing their activity into constructive channels. In ninety-nine per cent of such cases it would work to the detriment of society to enforce the sentences, because this would lead the offenders to lose the last of their self-respect, and, once inside of the prisons, to become real criminals from sheer hatred of society. When, within the five years following such a sentence, the individual commits a new offense, then he is condemned to fulfill the first sentence as well as a second sentence, in which he will be considered as a second offender.

VI

One of the most important innovations of the new code of procedure—and a necessary complement to the provisions of the substantive code—was the abolition of the jury system, that institution which is foreign to all efficacious criminal procedure, and which places the administration of justice in the hands of the mob.

The jury is an exotic plant transported to the Latin countries there to languish in hothouses. It is a legal duel, a spectacle to attract the multitudes and the best means for the orator to display his talents. But it contributes not in the least to social defense or to progress and it is absolutely useless as an instrument to combat delinquency. On the contrary, it is the greatest obstacle in the path of this struggle. If crime is the work of social individuals who live in the midst of society, if it is the manifestation of numerous factors, whether psychic or somatic or, most particularly, sociological; if, in order successfully to fight crime, it becomes necessary to study each distinct case to discover the causes and apply the cure; if all of this demands an individualistic study of the highest order and based on the most specialized knowledge, is it not senseless to submit the fate of the delinquent to the will of individuals chosen at random, and lacking in all necessary knowledge and responsibility? The public is not interested in administering justice. Its only concern is that justice be administered rapidly and efficaciously. The vices of the jury, *i.e.*, lack of responsibility, lack of education, lack of the need to preserve a good name, and of the principles on which to base their verdicts, are inherent in this institution and cannot be eliminated. All the remedies that have been advocated for it have only served to expose the grave defects from which it suffers. To preserve the jury system is equivalent to consulting the chauffeur, the cook and the errand boy on the advisability of having the master of the house operated on, in accordance with the examination and opinion of the specialists.

In order that the fight against delinquency may be effective, it is necessary, not only to abolish the jury system, but also to replace it by judges who are honorable and just, in the strict sense of these words. This cannot be accomplished until legislation insures to the

men who are entrusted with the administration of justice, political and economic independence, the first in order that they may specialize in their subject and devote all their time to self-improvement in this most important social field, and the second in order that they may not live under the constant threat of deposition for political reasons. When the judges find their economic problems solved, when they no longer have to fear the fortunes of politics and when they find the necessary stimulus in promotion on the basis of strict merit and seniority, and, further, when the faults they may incur are submitted to an impartial tribunal, there is no doubt but that they will administer justice. They will come close to the human ideal and the fight against delinquency will become truly effective.

Such are, in broad outline, the innovations of the new penal code, which it is hoped will diminish crime, provided the government complies with its obligations to make it truly operative with regard for none but social considerations, and without that attitude of vacillation and compromise which would lead to an unpardonable and inexcusable frustration of its purpose.

IX
MIGRATION

PAUL U. KELLOGG, leader of the discussions on National Contacts in this session of the Seminar in Mexico, is the editor of the Survey.

NATIONAL BORDERS

PAUL U. KELLOGG

OUR FAMILY has had a camp for ten years on a small lake running from Vermont to lower Quebec, so my interest in borders begins there. I have lived along the Canadian border for ten years and have talked with many Canadians about their problems. It might be more interesting to you not to spend our time on the Mexican border—that has been the subject of the Seminar in a way—but to take it up in a broader way, using this other example of a border to see if it has any application to the situation which begins and runs along the Rio Grande and then along an artificial border to the Pacific.

We associate the idea of borders with the conception that went with early ancient towns, when they erected those big walls for defense around centers of trade and buildings. With the coming in of gunpowder the craft of the wall maker was gone. The walls of the cities and castles were done away with. Gunpowder, which enabled Cortés to conquer Mexico, blew up the walls of Europe. The Chinese had built a wall across a large stretch of Asia. And now we are seeing that even great armored battleships are not effective against the attacks of airplanes and submarines. The day of the great fortified frontier is gone. With the airplane, the long-range guns, any sort of mechanical set-up that tends to find its safety in building great dikes of masonry is gone. Yet the armed forces that nations will have to depend on to defend borders will be there just so long as there is fear back of the border.

The answer to that fear is the building up of instruments of peace

that will take the place of the old war machines. This is one of the most significant developments of our modern time. There are those who lay their whole confidence in military and naval preparedness. So long as they can turn to history and show in every crisis that the army and navy have been called upon to defend the people, they have a point. The trouble is, it has not made for peace. Then there are those who stand for limitation of armaments and we have the London Naval Conference. At this time when all Europe has a standing army greater than in 1913, at a time when war budgets are larger than before the war, we cannot but feel the inconsistency and slow-going nature of this procedure.

Another method is to renounce war as a method of international principle. The Kellogg pact is the exponent of that thing. So long as we see the world armed to the teeth we can see that mere tools for peace have failed to carry confidence in a way that allays fear. The fourth alternative is the development of machinery of peace by which conflicts can be settled, by which adjustments in a growing world can be made. By creating those instruments of peace we may allay fear, reduce armaments, and become a world of neighbors instead of a world of potential enemies. The treaty of Locarno does just this. It sets up as a substitute for a geographic, military boundary the judicial boundary. This matter came up in Geneva. What was the Locarno treaty had a provision that all of the countries which had an interest in the Rhineland and its peace agreed that in case any of those countries broke their word and took recourse to armies instead of the civil instruments set up for conciliation and arbitration, that country by that act had invaded the other countries, had violated the judicial border, and all of the other signatories would come to the defense and help of the country invaded.

It sounds like a simple thing, yet I was told a year ago by one of the keenest British students of international affairs that this new method was slowly undermining the old fear that had held like a vise Western Europe. The policy of Europe for the ten years following the peace of Versailles had been dominated by fear on the part of France toward Germany, the fear that her neighbor would again take up arms and invade her. She had worked out at great cost military alliances with each of the small countries in Central Europe, such as

Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, so that in case Germany should revert to her old military tactics, the combined group would jump on Germany's back. This is the thing that dominated the underlying policy of Europe for the ten years following the war, because every other consideration had to be molded with that in view.

Then came the pact of Locarno. There was one country that France had not made her bargain with, Yugoslavia. Yet they are the best fighters in Europe. It would be more important for France to have her on her side than Poland, for the Poles are not fighters. Because this alliance had not been effected before the Locarno pact, France went through with it. When signed, the French people took it with more enthusiasm because the Locarno pact had erased that old fear. The importance of this strategic arrangement which might have been made with Yugoslavia was no longer what it had been two years before. This same critic said in time the whole policy of Central Europe would be readjusted.

Professor Shotwell illustrates this very thing in the Saar Valley incident. This is a dispute that arose over the fact that France wanted to increase her police force in that occupied territory. It happened that this issue came up just after Germany was admitted to the League of Nations and Germany challenged the right of France to thus increase her forces. France asserted that the Germans were trying to handicap France and the Germans made out that the French were really introducing into Germany new armed forces under cover of policing the Saar Valley. A meeting of the Council of the League of Nations was held. There were Frenchmen and Germans on each side of the table. There was a sense of humor among them. This became an issue, not between thirty million Frenchmen and fifty million Germans, but a question of whether five hundred cops could cover a certain territory. They all grinned and worked out the thing in a reasonable manner. Newspaper agitation evaporated and the different delegates shook each other by the hands. Briand said, "If we had had that machine in 1914, we might not have had the World War."

Gradually, piece by piece, we are creating these machines which have to do with the settlement of disputes which ordinarily come to heat and result in conflict, questions of fortifying the border. The

question of the border as central in conflict will go down just as rapidly as fear is allayed and this will be allayed as rapidly as we create these instruments by which the common sense and humor and imagination of people is given play.

Looking back historically, we see that while the border no longer exists as a thing measured in terms of walls, many of our conceptions still cling to that category. We tend to lump all people from one side of the border in a great mass, and then to personify it in a caricature.

I want to tell you the story of a district that was so remote that the people in those Appalachian Mountains had never seen mirrors. A peddler came to town and sought to sell some mirrors at a fair. He could not sell them as mirrors, but as pictures. Each purchaser was given a peek before he bought it. "Uncle Si" took one look into the mirror, "By ding! There's grandpop himself." And he bought it. He took his treasure home and, not wanting any one to see it, took it to the barn and covered it with straw in a barrel. He would often go and look at the mirror and it became the great treasure of his life. Of course, he hadn't done this many times before his wife realized that something was happening in the barn. She began exploring one day when he was gone and found the mirror. She looked into it, saw herself, and exclaimed, "So that's the hussy he is looking after."

In a way we are all Uncle Si and his wife. Great nations look at their neighbors and see caricatures of them. We have seen the characteristics of our neighbors distorted as in those strange mirrors we look into at fairs.

In the United States we think of ourselves in terms of Lincoln or Washington or Hoover, not in terms of Secretary Fall, for example. Yet many Mexicans think of the United States in just that way. Mexicans think of themselves in terms of Juárez or Calles, not in terms of—well, we will let them say in what terms. This enters into our feelings regarding peoples as we look across the border at each other.

Hendrik Van Loon in *The Forum* pointed out that all of us are like ancient cities where one digs up one stratum, then another and another. Van Loon points out that all of us are made up of these different strata. None of us realize how many epochs are involved in our own personality. Here is a modern skilled engineer who may be

of the vintage of Cotton Mather as far as religion goes. Here is a practical medical man who is the last word in X-rays, preventive medicine, etc. If you scratch him, however, you may find that his religious ideas are of the early primitive Christian church.

Van Loon says all of us in our approach to things have these strata. This is true also of the nations. We of the United States have in us strata that date back to epochs of our history, for example, the epoch when we were pushing back the Indians. This still enters into some American minds regarding Mexico. Then there was the period in which we were pushing out for land. This entered into the conflict over the Rio Grande, and still enters into the minds of some of us in our whole national outlook toward Mexico.

I remember talking with a Texas banker on a railroad train just before the Great War. His idea was that the United States should go down into Mexico and clean it up. Because we would do such a good job of it, he thought we should be paid for it by taking over the northern states. I said, "You wouldn't want to do that with the bank next door to you?" "Young man," he said, "you don't know anything about banking in Texas." That land-grabbing idea has entered into our whole Mexican psychology. Then we went through the cycle of the idea of exploiting our national resources. Doheny and Sinclair are only survivals of that early period.

Another question is that of immigration, a more recent issue between the United States and Mexico. It has come to a head in this very Congress, in an effort to pass a quota bill without putting the rest of North and South America on a quota. It is really an offshoot of a drive within the United States on the part of organized labor which was fundamental to a whole range of internal and domestic policies in the United States, having nothing to do originally with Mexico, but applying to the border at the Atlantic, shutting out the European, and at the Pacific border, shutting out China and Japan. The Canadian and Mexican doors were left open. As a result, a vacuum was created in the field of unskilled labor. The Mexican, being without sufficient employment, went to the United States in large numbers, and a problem arose in the United States owing to this influx.

If we cross the border and look at some of the issues from the

Mexican side, we see that they also primarily root in domestic problems, which were in the first place applied to Mexico, and only incidentally involved the United States, only so far as the United States had interests in Mexico. It was only as Americans came to own land in Mexico that we became involved in that situation. The oil problem was primarily a Mexican problem. The conception of oil in Mexico roots back in the old Spanish idea that a king owns the minerals beneath all lands. Because those domestic problems became involved in foreign interests, we have a whole series of hectic situations between nations.

A border is a thing quite intangible. It is the point of contact between two peoples where issues run. The issues that concern people in the main are not the clash over a border problem as such in a narrow geographic sense, but largely the fact that internal problems at their edges involve other peoples. It is something that starts out as a domestic issue, but becomes something of international concern, friction, and perhaps war.

My first contact with the Mexican border dates back to a time when our relations seemed very primitive. It was in the year 1916. I remember being in Cleveland that year and reading in the newspaper that our troops were being sent to the Mexican border. In the railroad yards I saw a long train of cars transporting the Massachusetts militia, bearing the words "On to Mexico City." Papers indicated that by morning we would be at war with Mexico. Then I read a little item in the paper to the effect that David Starr Jordan was in El Paso to see if he could not patch up matters and bring peace with Mexico. There is an interesting story behind that item. The American movement against militarism in that crisis had tried to get the American government to appoint a commission to meet with the Mexican commission to see if some way out of the impasse could not be found. Not getting any action, that group set out to do the thing on a voluntary basis. If we had actually been at war with Mexico, that body might have been jailed for treason. It asked Dr. Jordan and Mr. Moorefield Story of Boston, and one other person to form a committee to go to the border and meet with a similar committee from Mexico. Dr. Jordan had been the only member of the committee to get to the border. The people at El Paso resented his being there on that

sort of a mission. There was a movement on foot to tar and feather him and ride him out of town on a rail. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Jordan know him as a tall, lank, old man, who has given more vision to his students than perhaps any other teacher in America.

It happened that the leading banker of El Paso was one of his pupils. This man got the other bankers together and they organized a picket line and guarded the door of the room in the hotel where Dr. Jordan was staying. A newspaper man of the Associated Press was another of his pupils. He sent out little dispatches all over the country indicating that at least one man in the United States did not want to go to war with Mexico. As a matter of fact, in about a month it was discovered that most of the people did not want to go to war with Mexico. The commission moved to Washington where it met the Mexican commission, among the members of which was Dr. Atl. I became the other member of the United States commission. This commission managed to work out a joint statement and gave it out to the press.

This is just a little object lesson which proves that at least three persons from each country agreed on something. During the next year a joint commission was appointed in an endeavor to solve some of the difficulties that were involved in that border question. I remember while I was in Washington going to see Secretary of War Newton Baker, a man who had been mayor of Cleveland, a man who understood dealing with other men, chafing because he could not go to the Mexican border and see if through some plan of mutual coöperation with Mexican representatives something could not be done to do away with bandits. Because he was Secretary of War he could make no move in that matter. The Department of State was manned by a gentleman whose training was largely legalistic, and he would give no help in the matter.

If we go back to those days we see the utter failure of any channels by which reason and understanding and common sense can merge with each other in a solution of such problems. That, it seems to me, is the big contrast that we find today. After all, while I am going to talk about machinery of peace, the biggest thing lies in the personality of men who are openminded, meeting with each other. We have sent a great Ambassador to Mexico. Mexico has sent a great

Ambassador to the United States. There is a great change in the United States in the psychological attitude toward Mexico. One could almost see it creeping in. First we sent to Mexico our banker who had the reputation of being a man among all the bankers in New York who had imagination and human understanding. To add surety to the case we sent Mr. Lindbergh. Then we sent Mr. Will Rogers, who entirely changed the face of that mistrustful attitude toward Mexico on the part of the newspapers of the United States. It is the personal equation that will be the largest element in the contacts between nations. I submit that there is more of the innate quality of the United States embodied in Mr. Morrow than in any Ambassador we have sent to Mexico in the last fifty years. The same thing can be said of the Mexican Ambassador to the United States.

We are seeking to develop piece by piece other bits of machinery by which some of the issues are being worked out, by which the border is being broken up into its elements, by which the problems which have shuttled back and forth over that border, are being taken up by instruments of a modern sort. There is the whole question of debts, growing out of the period of civil unrest in Mexico. Of course, there was damage done to interests of all sorts. There has been created an impartial commission which, item by item, is attempting to work out some solution of this problem. Then there is the old, old problem of where the border line really runs. The Rio Grande has the happy custom of changing its course every now and again, and the people living along the border are never quite sure whether they live in the United States or Mexico. A commission has been appointed, the work of which is to try to settle that point. There is another commission trying to solve the problem of navigation rising in the Colorado.

I am citing the creation of these bodies because they form the beginning of the application of intelligence, of the scientific method to some of our problems. Instead of shooting at one another across the border, we create certain instruments the job of which is that of research, is that of examining the facts, not on the part of the United States alone or Mexico alone, but by joint research. After the facts are discovered there is then the attempt to find a formula which will conserve the rights of both sides.

It seems to me that I could perhaps tell of another structure, another method that has been worked out on the northern border, because possibly it offers some suggestions as to a method which may, not this year or next year, but in time, commend itself as something that could be made use of on our southern border. I refer to the joint international commission serving between the United States and Canada. I do not point it out with any sense of patriotic fervor, because the suggestion originated on the Canadian side.

If you were to look about to locate our own great fighting ground, it would not be along the Atlantic seaboard; the Revolution lasted only seven or eight years. It would not be along the Mason and Dixon Line; the Civil War lasted but four or five years. It would not be along our southern border; the War of the Forties was brief. It would not be in northern France or Belgium; that engaged us but eighteen months. It would be along that great northern boundary of ours, which runs for over three thousand miles, and where for two hundred years there was recurrent war: war between Huron and Iroquois; war between the Indians and French; war between the French and the English; war between England and the Colonials; wars into which savage practices entered with all their terrors; wars in which the feelings of Tories and Revolutionists were on edge; wars over fur and trade routes; but above all, wars over sovereignty and the possession of land, which have been the bones of contention in most of the national conflicts of the past.

"But," you may say, "that is an old story. That all happened long ago. We have had a hundred years of peace on that border. Those issues are dead." That is true, but it is not the whole story. In 1817 representatives of the British and American governments came together and patched up an understanding by which there was to be an unfortified boundary between the two countries, that each nation was entitled to a certain number of battleships, etc., but those ships have been out of date for ninety years. They could not last against the machine-gun at this date. So this agreement did hold, that renunciation of war along that border.

In crises between the United States and Mexico I have wished that we had something of the same sort. All this does not mean that by merely declaring there was no trouble between the two peoples, that

there were no difficulties. There are increasing difficulties along this northern border, difficulties of the sort that make people go to war, difficulties over land—Polk was elected on the slogan “44-40 or fight”; trouble over fur—the contest between the Hudson Bay Company and the big operators, such as the Astors, for example; controversies over gold; difficulties over water—and water can be as much a bone of contention as can land.

About two-thirds of this three thousand miles of our border runs through lakes and navigable streams. In this fact lie possibilities of conflict over navigation and irrigation and power. The thing got out of hand; there were two old open sores; there were many disputes ranging over many years. In 1890 a Canadian engineer suggested that it might be well to appoint a joint commission, and in 1902 such a body was appointed. It was purely an investigational body, but it broke enough ground so that Lord Bryce and Elihu Root in 1909 conceived the idea of setting up a permanent tribunal, the International Joint Commission. This commission has had twenty-one years of experience.

Under this commission several things were agreed upon: First, it was agreed that each country would retain absolute jurisdiction over the waters within its own territory flowing into boundary waters. There is the recognition of sovereignty. Second, obviously something could be done to a stream in the United States that would be damaging to a Canadian stream further down, a blockade for example. It was agreed that a Canadian who suffered such a loss could sue in the courts of the United States and have the same status as an American citizen in pressing his claim, or vice versa. It provided also that there should be no further obstructions or handling of boundary water on the part of citizens or governments on either side without the consent of this commission. This commission's judgment is made final on application of either side on any other issue of boundary coming before this commission. Third, it provided that any other issue between the two countries could be brought before the commission on the initiative of either country and with the consent of the other.

In this commission has been set up something very flexible and broad in its powers. The commission has created a status for itself which has been recognized by both countries as almost separate from

either government. Its records, its files, have an integrity which cannot be disturbed by either government. In its aspect as a tribunal it has a certain poise, a certain status, that enables it to handle difficult situations with confidence and competence. Its functioning has been as organic and real as that of a truly judicial tribunal.

The commission confronted from the start physical problems for the most part. There was a row as to whether or not the Soo Canal should be handled in a certain way which was considered adverse to the United States interests, or in another way adverse to Canadian interests. There was the question as to whether Chicago should use a very generous helping of the waters of the Great Lakes. There were questions involving great power sites. There was the whole question of sanitation. Canadian towns were shouting that Detroit was dumping its sewage into the lakes in a manner which was endangering the lives of Canadian citizens. The result was the most extensive sanitary survey of water ever carried out in the world, and the dumping of sewage into the lakes was eliminated.

There were engineering problems in which great and antagonistic interests were at stake. When these interests brought in their reports and submitted them to the commission, that body has acted on them unanimously. It has not only rendered these decisions but in some cases it has been entrusted with their enforcement. The commission has no more power than the United States Supreme Court, which as a matter of fact has all the power in the United States, that being a moral power.

It has not been a simple thing, with Chicago, Duluth, Toronto, Montreal and New York, all at different times feeling that their property and their real future were at stake in some of these issues. After all, while the St. Lawrence is the great jugular vein of Canada, it is also one of the two great arteries that tap our Middle West. The International Joint Commission is an engineering rather than a legal or a militaristic set-up. It is one of the most important single developments that we have in the New World in the field of international relations. When Ramsay MacDonald was in Toronto a year ago the subject of this international commission came up. He said with considerable eagerness that here was a principle that might be embodied in some of the boundary problems of Europe.

I should like to distinguish this commission from the temporary commission, the commission appointed to tackle some particular problem. Some of these must be solved by the give and take of two ambassadors representing two governments. There are other situations that lend themselves to the approach of a single temporary commission of some sort, perhaps with a neutral chairman, that ventilates the situation and brings it constructively to a head. There are certain advantages to an enduring commission. This sort of commission has no neutral chairman with which both sides need to flirt. It cannot make a killing in one decision and get away with it, for it must sit in on all the following hearings. It deals with the man on the other side of the table rather than with the people at home.

Perhaps this international commission is not uniformly applicable, but surely it has seemed to work. We find in it the beginnings of the new fabric of peace, an instrument by which great peoples can live next to each other in peace, and work together as neighbors, throwing the throttle from conflict to coöperation, from self-defense to mutual benefit. Perhaps with an engineer in the White House and an engineer in Chapultepec Castle there can be worked out an engineering scheme for the settling of problems between the United States and Mexico.

MEXICAN IMMIGRATION

PAUL U. KELLOGG

THERE are three points to be considered in connection with Mexican immigration: (1) The spread of Mexican immigration in the United States; (2) The various moves to control it; (3) The situation from the Mexican angle and the immigrants returning to Mexico.

In the background preceding this question, first of all is the situation that came before the World War; that is, that north of the border in New Mexico and some of the adjoining states lived a resident population of Spanish Americans, so-called, Spanish colonial people who have traces of Spanish blood and Indian blood in their veins,

who have been residents there and their ancestors before them before the Pilgrims landed, who are the oldest indigenous group in America. They had brought a habit of life that was part of the general trend of Spanish America itself. In Texas and southern California there are groups of these people and large communities of Mexicans and Spanish Americans.

Then came the war and the shutting down of immigration on the rest of the world. The quota system shut the door to the east, and closed the door to the west to oriental immigration. In passing that law we left open the door to Canada and to all Latin America. That situation—the shutting out of cheap labor supplying work in the mines and mills—created a vacuum. Into that vacuum came two streams of common laborers, negroes from the southern cotton fields and towns, making their way north to St. Louis, Chicago, New York, etc., developing great negro communities in these cities. Coming out of that movement is a sort of renaissance of the negro in his arts, music and drama, complementing the contribution of spiritual qualities he is making to our common life. The history of the negro's northward migration, singing as he came, is a remarkable one.

This was not the only northward movement. There was also the northward movement of Mexicans, spreading out like a great fan from the Rio Grande north, across New Mexico, Texas, Arizona, California, following the lines of railway and the lines of the development of immigration. Going up in Fords into the California Valley, great hordes came to care for the crops, taking the place of the old tenant farmers in Texas. Northern agriculturists have wanted this sort of thing, so that Texas passed a law prohibiting the Colorado wheat companies from fishing in their preserves. Agencies for the railroads gave inducements to the people going into the industrial districts of Chicago and the automobile districts around Detroit. More recently has come the agitation to shut off that migration. Several factors are involved:

(1) There is the general sentiment that was associated with the early effort to shut off earlier European immigration, the desire to keep the United States clear of aliens, to be 100% American, etc.

(2) The fact that the Mexican has been coming up from unskilled to skilled labor. The American Federation of Labor, which had been

holding out hands to the Mexican Federation, has come out for measures of restriction. This movement came to a head in the current session of Congress in the Harris Bill, which would put restriction on immigration from Mexico. This has been opposed by many men who, regardless of whether they wanted a large stream of labor coming from Mexico or not, thought this was a stupid way, which would alienate Mexico. We have had in the last two years an effort by the State Department to bring a measure of control over this migratory labor, doing it through a new system of consular visas, so much so that last month the number of Mexicans who came into the United States was very small, indeed, smaller than if there had been quota legislation of any sort. In the midst of this great movement of people north and the utilization of them in the crops and heavy industries, there has been a swift about-face. There has developed a situation in which the flow was stopped with the legal officials carrying on wholesale deportation processes to shoot back over the border people who had come without going through the formalities. There had been no formality in the situation throughout preceding years. There were thousands of Mexicans in the United States who had no papers. They may not have been those who just crossed the River to Texas, but they were those who had not gone through any formalities. People who have come recently have been subjected to crude and wholesale deportation processes.

At this session of Congress the Harris Bill failed of passage. The most convincing method by which it was stalled off was the successful demonstration by the State Department that migratory labor could be controlled without resorting to any such discriminatory and adverse methods.

Dr. Manuel Gamio's suggestion is that we should work out some plan by which agricultural labor could go north. Under a very effective plan they would be distributed to the points where such labor was needed, with their return assured so that they would not become communities of unemployed people during times of unemployment. This is similar to various international arrangements worked out in Europe, by which, for example, Polish labor is brought into Germany and Italian labor brought into France. Whether any such scheme will be worked out remains to be seen. The point is if we are going to

carry out a plan of immigration control between the United States and Mexico, and Dr. Gamio felt that controlled immigration would be to the advantage of both countries, then we need a more adequate functioning of our Federal Employment Service. It is not a question of merely shifting human beings at the border, but of protecting them while in this country so as to avoid those tragic cases of mistreatment when too many Mexican families have been thrown without resources into the cities in the Northwest, or such experiences as have grown out of crude handling of men seeking work through our private agencies.

In this process there have been thrown back into Mexico, because of deportation, large numbers of Mexicans, creating a serious situation in the border provinces along the Rio Grande. The conditions faced by the deported groups are appealing and tragic.

There is one final point. Most of us are dissatisfied with the crudeness of the present quota law. Here is one border land where that law does not apply, where there is a chance for the United States and Mexico to work out mutually a plan dealing with immigration scientifically and efficiently.

ANNIE CLO WATSON is secretary of the International Institute of the Y. W. C. A., San Antonio, Texas.

MEXICANS IN TEXAS

ANNIE CLO WATSON

SOMETIMES when we talk with the Mexican immigrant in southern Texas I feel that it should be the other way around. The Mexicans have been there for so many generations. They have given the

land a rhythm and it sometimes seems as though we were the immigrants and out of tune with the Mexican rhythm of southwest Texas. We have had three general groups: (1) The old entrenched group; (2) the newly arrived immigrant who comes and settles in a colony; (3) seasonal laborers, men, women and children, who travel around the country on any road in wagons, but mostly in trucks or old Fords. They go from sowing time to harvest time, from one community to another. They have very little household equipment. They camp, perhaps in the onion fields when it is the time of onions; when it is strawberry time they camp there; in cotton picking time they camp where the cotton is. When all of this is over, in the few months when there is not much doing, these people drift into some small town or to San Antonio. The schools are conscious of an influx of children for a few months, and just as they came quietly, they go quietly. For the seasonal laborer the every-day life goes on under these conditions. There is no chance for these people to keep up their old traditions or to establish new traditions.

It has not been the custom very long for us to think of the Mexican people as immigrants in southwest Texas. They seem to have belonged there. There was an easy come and go across the border. Regulations were not strictly enforced. Between 1924, when the quota law was passed, and the spring of 1929, Mexicans came in large numbers. In 1928 there was the largest immigration. More than 50,000 Mexicans entered the United States as immigrants. This does not count those coming temporarily. This is the largest group that entered the United States from any one race or nation during that year. More than half of these came through Texas ports, the port of Laredo chiefly, going to all parts of the United States. From 1927 until the early part of 1929 we had contacts with 1,000 to 1,200 of these people. They told us many stories, some of them eloquent of the things that had happened. This migratory group would make a fan, spreading out from Texas to Minnesota alone. There were 200 villages in the beet sugar section to which Mexicans were shipped from San Antonio. They came from various trades in Mexico, but most of them from ranches and small trades. In the United States they were going into the beet country, into the mills, into the railways, and the automobile and packing house industries, and into the various fields.

The stories these people told us about the mode of travel from their homes were often very pathetic. Some came by train. When they got to the border they encountered a man who was going to bring them to San Antonio. Often this person had no intention of dealing with them squarely. We had enough stories from these people to know that there was much exploitation in the travel process. The people were made to pay for various things that we would not have to pay for. Those who came to San Antonio were carried to the labor offices. There are a good many of them in San Antonio. If one went among them he had the feeling that there was a great business going on. This was in 1927 and 1928, when shipments were at their height. One felt that he might be standing on the docks where some great ship was being loaded. A good many of the Mexicans came in in the wee hours of night and were shipped out before daybreak next morning, men, women and children packed together in cars without any idea of comfort. The cars were jammed so full that often the men had to ride on the running board. There were delays along the way. Sometimes there were long delays in San Antonio. The people came without too much money. As they sat around labor agencies they soon spent their money. Sometimes they had sickness and other difficulties while in a temporary shelter. Lodgings were not inspected and there was danger of illness.

Delays occurred further along the way. One family wrote back from Minnesota that it had taken them three weeks to get there. You may say if you have passed through Mexico and seen the primitive accommodations along the way, that perhaps housing did not matter so much, but it does matter. There is a difference between a thatched hut on a wind-swept hill and a shack in an alley of a city where many generations of lodgers have lived.

We could have told these people that there were many ravages to which they would be subjected. They would be subjected to the ravage of change, change in food and clothes, climate, language; change from patriarchal groups coming into cities where the tendency was to break up family life; change from agriculture to industry; from women working in homes to women working outside of homes. They would be heirs to all the spiritual ills of a transplanted people.

Just as this flock of people was going northward there came the

checking of it by two movements, a deportation law going into effect last spring, and the strict enforcement of immigration regulations. It was almost like an immigration revolution, and it carried with it much of the suffering that goes with any kind of revolution. In spite of the apparent outward differences of immigrants, I want to add this. We like to read about the high motives with which our Puritan ancestors came to the United States. As we talked with these people we asked them why they had come. They gave us many reasons. Some of them came in a sense of disappointment, some came hopefully, some courageously, some with a sense of adventure, some with a stoical acceptance of life. All of them came with very high ideals, with worthy motives, thinking that they were coming to a land of opportunity where they could find a better way of living. The brown people who came from the south and the white people who came from across the Atlantic are alike in that respect.

How does the Mexican fit in the Southwest? Does he become a part of the stream of American life? I will give some of the evidences from San Antonio. In San Antonio the street names are largely Spanish. Much of the architecture is of the Mexican type. If we should entertain you in the best fashion we would have Mexican music and dances, we would take you to see some interesting *patios*. You would hear much of the Spanish language, even among the most American of us. You would take home Mexican curios. Our *fiestas* are Mexican; the very word is Mexican. The trees and other things of the garden have Spanish names. We eat fruit that is Mexican.

In the economic scale Mexicans are found on every round of the ladder. This evidence is to be seen in the homes. One goes from the humblest home to the show places of San Antonio. There are no building restrictions. A Mexican may build a home anywhere if he has the money. Mexicans in business also run the whole scale from the laborer to the professional men, doctors, lawyers, teachers. Politically the Mexican is a factor that cannot be ignored. The schools are open to Mexicans without any segregation and they take advantage of schooling. They are in the schools, from the primary schools all through the junior colleges. Many go on to the university and art schools. Some have very good records indeed in professional work,

particularly in engineering. In the arts they excel. They are outstanding among the artistic people of the city.

You might say, these are the so-called high class. In San Antonio you can find a cross-section of all types of Mexicans that live in Mexico, because they have been coming in for many years. It isn't just the so-called higher type of Mexicans that does reach the top in education and in other fields. The assistant superintendent of schools in San Antonio is much interested in the Mexican people, and in collaboration with a professor of the University of Texas he has made a study of many Mexican families in San Antonio. He has taught in San Antonio for forty years and knows the situation from actual experience. Many families came and lived in huts in outlying sections of the city. Their descendants may have cottages with all modern conveniences. One immigrant Mexican in San Antonio came out of Mexico when he was eighteen or twenty years old. He built a business for himself, starting with \$200, a butcher shop. He built up a business valued today at more than \$200,000. He has American salesmen working for him. This man has many Indian characteristics. He occasionally goes through the southern part of the State with the American salesmen. He cannot go with his salesmen to the best hotels and cafes. He goes to the Mexican section. They go to the best hotels and he pays the bill.

Assimilation is not complete in San Antonio. What has been attained has come with struggle. There is another side to the picture. There are housing conditions that are very bad, especially in the corrals back of business houses and streets where many families are living. Sanitary conditions are just as bad as possible. Industrial conditions are far from being good. Here is one example which deals with the working tradition of women. Various states in the north have outlawed the sweatshop, but some companies making baby dresses and children's clothing have come down to San Antonio. The garments are cut out in a central office, women taking them home to work on them. Wages are low. There is no inspection of conditions under which they are working.

Then the Mexican is subjected to all of the social prejudices. The Mexican is technically white, that is, he can go where the white people go. There is, however, a deep underlying social prejudice. "That Mex-

ican" more or less describes the attitude of Americans toward Mexicans. In small towns there is segregation more like that of the Negro, the Mexican being segregated in theaters and debarred from hotels.

There is no greater experiment anywhere in the United States in working out a humane immigration policy, in dealing with the social problems of a transplanted people than with our Mexican group. It deserves the best thought of us all. I will close with a story. There came up from the lower part of Mexico a patriarchal group of weavers, grandfather, son and grandsons. They wove *zerapes* and hats as they had done for so many generations. They went through many difficulties in San Antonio. We thought they must be discouraged and would want to go back. But, no, they had set themselves to a task and wanted to go on. They were looking for a better way of life. They had very little property with them, only their *zerapes* and hats. They had come to America to find a job. They went to one of the employment agencies, and after some time they were sent to the steel mills in a northern city. I know that social workers are supposed to have no feeling, that they are supposed to be very objective. But I have always had a painful feeling when I think of what my country missed when those people, artists and craftsmen, went into the steel mills, and of the bitter and tragic experiences they must have gone through.

JAMES HOFFMAN BATTEN, executive director of the Inter-American Foundation, Pomona College, which exchanges students with Mexico, is constantly working for a better understanding between the United States and Mexico.

MEXICANS IN CALIFORNIA

JAMES H. BATTEN

THE PROGRESS of the Mexicans in Texas is being duplicated in California. In the great Mexican section in Los Angeles, 63% own their homes. Seventy per cent of the homes owned by the Mexican group are clean and sanitary, 15% are probably making some progress in cleanliness and sanitation, 15% are positively filthy. This shows an upward trend. Of the few thousand inhabitants in Orange County over two hundred Mexicans have savings bank accounts and over one hundred loan accounts. These Mexicans are very easily assimilated. This does not mean that the illiterate peon will be easily assimilated into American life, but his children who are attending American schools and who were born in America will absorb American ideals. The third generation will be genuine American citizens. They get hold of American ideals very quickly. Take the matter of athletics, for instance. In the senior and junior Olympic games reported by the *Los Angeles Times*, two of the four winners were Mexican boys and the outstanding winner was a Mexican boy. In the senior and junior games this year a Mexican boy was the winner of the junior event and a Philippine boy won second place.

In connection with the reduction of the number of immigrants from Mexico, during the last three months not a single member of the unskilled laboring class, such as the Harris Bill has been aimed at, has been allowed to enter. Those who are opposed to Mexican im-

migration entirely will say it may be true that the strict enforcement by the State Department of visa laws will reduce the entries but that they are still coming over illegally in veritable floods. This is not true. When the State Department was not enforcing the visa laws it was considered all right for a peon to enter because he was considered necessary to labor in the Southwest. With the strict enforcement of the laws governing issuance of visas to peon classes, the border patrol was increased and increased vigilance given to irregular entries. I think this has largely reduced the number of Mexicans entering the United States illegally. The figures for those returning show that during the last eighteen months 60,000 more have returned to Mexico than have entered.

Josh Billings once said, "It is better not to know so many things than to know so many things that aren't so." The difficulty with our congressmen is that they know so many things that aren't so. Congressman Albert Johnson of Washington said it was necessary that this legislation should be enacted in order to save California for the Californians. He declared that the Mexicans coming into the western United States were making a reconquest of California; that they were pushing the native-born Americans in California further into the north. I have not noticed any particular migration of Californians northward. This statement is manufactured out of whole cloth. Even if they were making such a conquest they were making it by honest labor, very different from our conquest in '48.

In connection with the proposal of Dr. Manuel Gamio regarding transitory immigration into the United States to meet the demands of seasonal labor: I do not believe in it. I do not believe in any kind of contract labor. I believe it would be harmful to the best interests of the Mexicans in the United States. I am convinced that we have Mexicans enough in the Southwest now to meet the demands of labor if properly distributed. The difficulty is that the Mexicans in the United States today are an asset in a certain territory and a liability in another territory. When the Mexican is through with casual labor he drifts into Los Angeles or other towns, and if he is without labor, he eventually applies for relief, but not until he is compelled to do so. He will take into his family his relatives and friends rather than let them apply for help. In the interest of the Mexicans now in the

United States, I do not believe in this plan of transitory immigration.

Nor do I believe in it in the interest of a better agricultural system in the Southwest. Agriculture in California is perhaps the most highly developed in the United States so far as production and distribution are concerned. There has never been any attempt to form an organization for permanent employment of labor in those sections. Whether it is with a wide open border or whether under Dr. Gamio's theory, just so long as Mexican common labor can be brought into these California valleys to meet the casual demand of that particular period, no effort will be made toward diversification of crops to give employment for nine or ten months. Yet I feel it could be done in some cases. I believe this problem can be worked out gradually. It is being done on some ranches, where they are able to employ their labor over a large period of the year at reasonable wages. The problem is not one of low wages but of the casual nature of work. The wages paid are high, but measured by the year you will find that the average family income of the Mexican in Southern California from Fresno to the Mexican border line is about \$800 per year simply because of this casual work. The transitory immigration proposed would continue that situation so far as the Mexican already in California is concerned. In the interest of progressive development of agriculture in California I am opposed to any such practice. I am opposed also simply because of the fact that I do not believe in the application of either immigration laws or tariff laws to any of the countries of Latin America. I do not believe in any restriction except for physical and mental incompetence. We may have Leagues of Nations or disarmament conferences, but as long as there are immigration laws and tariff laws there will be wars. My protest is against the introduction of laws of that kind so far as Latin America is concerned. Let us give the world a real picture of commercial and cultural and brotherly neighbors.

*GEORGE H. WINTERS, of the United States Consular Service,
is Vice Consul at Mexico City.*

IMMIGRATION CONTROL THROUGH THE CONSULAR SERVICE

GEORGE H. WINTERS

I SHOULD like to tell you a little about what the Consular Service is doing and has been doing during the last eighteen months in connection with Mexican immigration. All immigrants proceeding to the United States are required as a prerequisite of admission to present valid visas, obtainable only from the American Consular office. Therein lies our task. You are aware of the fact that during the past several years and prior to 1929 there was a very decided increase in Mexican immigration to the United States. Causes have been described as unrest in Mexico, better opportunity for employment in the United States, coupled with the possibility of entering the United States because of the fact that the Mexican was not and is not subject to the quota restriction. In order to obtain a visa he does not have to wait his turn under the quota as is the case with many who formerly constituted our labor supply in the United States.

You are familiar with the legislation proposed during recent years to limit Mexican immigration by putting Mexico under the quota, but leaving the other Latin American countries without quota restriction. The Harris Bill was considered during the last session of Congress. It placed the Mexicans under a quota of about 1,900 a year. The Department of State has not favored such legislation on the ground that it is not necessary and that existing laws adequately enforced are sufficient.

Section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, describes

some twenty-five or thirty classes of alien immigrants not to be admitted to the United States. Without enumerating all of these classes I should like to make mention of the following, under which a great many of the laboring classes of Mexico are found to be unacceptable: persons who are likely to become public charges, illiterates, contract laborers. The last are defined as those who have been induced to migrate to the United States by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers are true or false. This provision is very inclusive. The Immigration Act of 1924 provides that no immigrant visa shall be issued if it appears to the officials that the immigrant is unacceptable under the immigration laws. The responsibility of the Consular officers is obvious. They determine in the first instance the acceptability of applicants and refuse visas in those cases in which the applicants are believed to be unacceptable.

Since February, 1929, stricter enforcement of the immigration laws has been put into effect. As a result of such enforcement there has been a very decided decrease in the number of visas issued. By way of showing this decrease I want to quote the following figures, showing the monthly issuance of visas during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1928, and June 30, 1930.

	1928		1930
July	6,583	July	1,930
Aug.	5,897	Aug.	1,623
Sept.	4,548	Sept.	1,429
Oct.	4,030	Oct.	1,263
Nov.	3,936	Nov.	1,024
Dec.	3,743	Dec.	832
Jan.	3,425	Jan.	864
Feb.	4,175	Feb.	772
Mar.	6,081	Mar.	726
Apr.	6,334	Apr.	540
May	5,001	May	400
June	4,393	June	307

The total for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, was 58,146; for the fiscal year ending June, 1930, 11,793. This shows a decrease of approximately 80%. Of the total issued during the fiscal year just ended, 11,622 were issued by Consular officers in Mexico, the balance of 121 having been issued by Consular officers in other countries.

During the past few months we have had the effective coöperation of the Mexican Immigration Service. In former years a large number of seasonal laborers from the interior of Mexico have proceeded to the border without obtaining visas and applied for them at the border. A great many of these laborers are now unacceptable. The Mexican Immigration Service has established offices at Guanajuato, Monterey, Torreon and other centers, with the view of preventing the coming to the border of workmen who have not provided themselves with the necessary visas for admission to the United States. The purpose of these offices is to avoid hardship on the part of those who probably cannot gain admission if permitted to proceed to the border. The Mexican Government has given publicity as to the advisability of applying for visas at the nearest office.

The decrease in the number of visas resulting from the strict application of the provisions of the immigration law has naturally been accompanied by an improvement in the class of those admitted. Of the 11,672 visas issued, 15% were issued to persons who were going to the United States to study; about 1% were relatives who were accompanying students; 20% of the number had been residing in the United States unlawfully and they obtained visas in order to legalize their status. This does not mean they avoided the immigration law. They had entered without filling certain requirements now in force. These four classes account for more than 50% of the total number; 21.6% were wives and minor children of lawfully admitted residents of the United States. Only 3,177, or 22.2%, were not members of one of these five classes. During the entire year only 1,129 common laborers were admitted who had not previously lived in the United States. During the last three months not a single visa has been issued to such an immigrant.

In connection with this reduction I want to read from the statement of the Undersecretary of State before the Committee on Immigration of the House of Representatives on May 15. This includes the most recent figures. "I want to tell you who the 11,793 were. Of this number we find 1,609 students coming to the United States to attend school and who will not be affected by any quota. They will not even be affected by the Harris or Box Bill. 2,238 are now residents of the United States who returned to Mexico for the purpose of

legalizing their status, and 1,631 have resided in the United States and are not newcomers. Practically one-half of this number are hardly immigrants at all. Of the remaining, 2,304 were wives or minor children of admitted aliens. Only 29% of the total remains, which represents new Mexican immigration some part of which the Harris Bill would have stopped. These are examined by the Consul and are not contract labor and are not likely to become public charges. This number cannot include any large proportion of the usual Mexican labor. The Harris Bill will not keep out of the United States any more than 1,000 workmen a year."

I should like to refer to a phase of Mexican immigration which has been mentioned and which Dr. Manuel Gamio would have stressed, that is, the temporary nature of Mexican immigration. I refer to the fact, supported by statistics of the Mexican Government, that a considerable part of Mexican immigration is temporary. A large number of workmen proceed to the United States in search of seasonal labor and at the end of the season they return until the following year. Except for the original entry these are not new immigrants, although they are often required to obtain new visas for return to the United States.

MANUEL GAMIO, former Director of the Bureau of Anthropology and Sub-Secretary of the Department of Education of Mexico. Author of "Aspects of Mexican Civilization," "Mexican Immigration to the United States"; a member of the Supreme Council of Social Protection and Prevention which carries out the provisions of the new penal code.

TEMPORARY MEXICAN IMMIGRATION

MANUEL GAMIO

FROM THE time I was a student in one of the best known American universities, Columbia, I began to realize that the most important, or at least one of the most important means for a closer understanding between our two countries was in the contact of their intellectual elements. Numerous study trips which I made to the United States later on confirmed these youthful ideas. In lectures before the Carnegie Institute in 1924 I proposed that students interested in the human aspects of Mexican-American relations come to Mexico and with technical investigations help the progress of international relations, which were then not so happy. A little more than four years ago I emphasized such propositions before the Harris Institute of the University of Chicago, and added that it would be desirable if the American legations and embassies in Latin America added to their staffs specialists in the social sciences so that the American people could have reliable information as to certain of our characteristics which appear to be the source of international difficulties, but which in reality are not.

Various American scientists have come to study conditions in Mexico, honestly and conscientiously, and the American Embassy is continually receiving such information. On the other hand, luckily for

the United States to attempt to limit the increase of such groups. On the other hand I showed that temporary or transitory immigration of Mexicans is desirable, or at least not harmful, for as these are continually going from one country to the other, interracial, intercultural and economic difficulties do not arise.

It might be argued that my proposition might be sound from the Mexican but not from the American point of view, and that for that reason the Harris Bill is all right since it was made for American and not for Mexican interests.

I will show that this bill, however, is undesirable even for exclusively American interests. Although the United States is the most powerful country in the world at this time, I feel sure that the American public will wisely not wish to harm uselessly the interests of twenty Latin American countries. Had the American people known that a method has always existed for the restriction of Mexicans into the United States, whether they be transient or permanent immigrants under the old immigration law, then I feel sure the American representatives in Congress would not have voted for the Harris Bill, and the Mexican and Latin American people in general would not have had any reason to feel hurt by a hostile American attitude.

Such a means was already in the hands of the American people under the present immigration law, which rules that no one can be admitted as an immigrant who cannot read. An optimistic estimate places the number of those in Mexico who can read at from 15 to 25% of the total population, so that the proportion of illiterates among immigrants may be as high as 90%, since as a rule immigrants belong to the humble and uneducated classes.

The number of Mexicans who yearly, according to official data, entered the United States from 1910 to 1928 was an average of 40,000 persons of whom according to the preceding estimates only 10% or 4,000 individuals—a number approximately equivalent to that sanctioned by the Harris Bill—could read.

This bill, which has brought bitter criticisms of Latin America upon the United States leads to the same results which could have been obtained if the existing law had been literally applied.

I have taken the liberty of presenting to you this point of view

so that it might become known to the American people, not with the intention of continually criticizing the Harris Bill, but with the hope that future American-Mexican problems might be better understood and interpreted for the good of the relations between our countries.

X

**THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
IN MEXICO**

AARÓN SÁENZ, a leader in the political life of Mexico; former Governor of Nuevo Leon; former Minister of Foreign Affairs; Minister of Public Education.

THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEXICO

AARÓN SÁENZ

As a preliminary explanation, I am going to mention certain general characteristics of our political system so that you may the more clearly understand it. The political organization of Mexico will not be new to the members of this Seminar for it is fundamentally the same as that in your own country. The origin of our political system is essentially North American, as is that of the other Latin American countries which have been inspired in the experience and political organization of the United States.

Prior to Independence, Mexico, with respect to the union of provinces making up New Spain during the Colonial period, was a unified whole. Our federal organization, at the time of its adoption, was not a response to any situation previously created, nor did there exist sufficient historical antecedents to justify such governmental organization; but, at the time Independence was declared in Mexico, not only the influence and the example of the United States, but certain characteristics which had manifested themselves in diverse provinces, resulted in the authors of the Independence adopting the federal system as the best possible political régime. On referring to the influence of the United States, I want to complete my idea concerning the moral influence which the movement of organizations in the United States had in Mexico and throughout the Latin-American countries. This influence manifests itself in the clear and definite orientations toward

liberty, toward independent organization in matters concerning the fundamental rights of man.

An essentially nationalistic character predominated in Mexico in the first years of the period of Independence, an idea of national unity which was to become more clearly defined with the adoption of the system of Federal Government proclaimed by the Constitution of 1824 and with the consummation of Independence, but as this condition was not subject to any harmonious development, from 1825 to 1857 we suffered diverse variants of political character in that our organization went from federalism to centralism until 1857, when the federal system was established permanently in Mexico.

Our present organization differs in some details from the organization established by the Constitution of 1857, but, as a matter of fact, fundamentally we live today within the principles proclaimed in that document. According to our present Constitution, the international personality of Mexico is reserved to the Federal Government and the sovereignty of the Republic is exercised through that entity. In consequence, the maintenance of relations with other countries of the world and the special faculty of celebrating international treaties are reserved exclusively to the Federal Government.

The Federation has exclusive control in matters concerning interior organization, especially with respect to the country's security; thus, the army which is the basis of order, is absolutely controlled by the Federal Government. And in this respect, other functions of an official character which are reserved to the Federation may be mentioned here, the question of international commerce, customs, traffic in general, of the country's commerce and industries.

From the point of view of the interior organization, the states are the basic political units within the federal system. With respect to the states, the fundamental principle of our organization is that, save for certain faculties expressly reserved to the Federal Government by the Constitution of Mexico, they possess all powers as sovereign entities from the point of view of their interior régime. Nevertheless, the tendency of our régime is in certain aspects to accentuate the federal authority and to make it predominant over the states.

Within the organization of the states, the fundamental basis of our federal system is the freedom of the municipality. The institution

of the free municipality is intended to guarantee to the villages the possibility of self-government without the intervention of any other authority.

However, in obedience on the one hand to the tradition of the Colonial epoch, and on the other to certain circumstances of special character on the part of the states, the natural resources of the country have remained under federal control. Partly due to the principle current during the Colonial epoch, that the rights of property belonged to the Sovereign, and partly due to the difficulties our states faced either in safeguarding or developing the natural resources, the mines, the oil, the waters and principally the land have been reserved to the federal authorities, in conformity with the Constitution. Some other activities, such as communications, were reserved to the Federation with the result that railroads, postoffices, the telegraph system are activities which are under the control of the Federal Government.

Within our concept, the Federation guarantees the national unity of our country, and this national unity is safeguarded in the following aspects: as regards Mexico's international personality as a sovereign nation; as regards its interior security in the maintenance of an army and of authorities who guard the peace of the country. The fact that the Federation maintains the national unity is, on the one hand, a logical consequence of the arbitrary form in which our states were constituted—in obedience to no reason of geographical, historical or physical character, but rather along the lines dividing the provinces during the Spanish-Colonial epoch. On the other hand, our states lack the legislation, the economic history, and one or more, as the case may be, of the fundamental elements necessary to the complete fulfillment of their function and life as a state. Moreover, the necessities of the country's harmonious development cannot be limited or kept within the frontiers of the states. All these considerations have played an important part in determining the adoption of our federal system.

Our Constitution authorizes the Federal Government to intervene in the states in certain cases, especially when, in conformance with certain precedents or for other valid circumstances such intervention becomes a necessity or when the constitutional order within the state has disappeared. In such case, the Federal authority is exercised

through the medium of the President of the Republic and the Senate, and the natural consequence of this intervention is limited to the reestablishment of constitutional order within the state.

We may say then, in summary of the foregoing, that our governmental régime in Mexico is predominantly federal.

Next, I am going to present to you some aspects of our institutional and political life as they really exist.

Starting from the principle of federalism in Mexico, experience shows us that in our public life we are tending more and more toward a predominance of the Federation and a decline of the organization and rights of the states.

The domination of the Federation over the states is especially noticeable in the economic aspect of the life of our Republic. The best resources of the country have been reserved to the Federation to take care of its needs as a government. The Federal Government possesses greater authority to see that its general acts and its dispositions of an economic character are respected and carried out. Its collection of customs is much more efficient than that of the states due to better organization within its offices and because a clear delineation of just what customs belong to the states is lacking. In general, the Federation has refused to give the states any participation in the customs. Some participation has been established, but it is the exception, and then chiefly in connection with natural resources,—mines, oil, woods and so forth.

With respect to the Federation's influence in the country from an economic point of view, it may be concluded that there is a gradual and systematic absorption of the states by the Federation.

A very important aspect of our situation is to be found in the matter of legislation. In regard to the principle of the sovereignty of the states within their confines, actual experience has demonstrated to us the impossibility of respecting this legislative independence due to the difficulties which arise and to the distinct criteria in which different circumstances have placed us. Given the intimate interrelation between the villages and their imperative necessity to live together in harmony, a system of absolute independence on the part of the states could not have been accepted without injury to some aspect or other of the national life and of the life of the states. Thus, confronted with the

necessity of unifying certain principles so that we might solve certain of our problems, we have come to adopt practically legislative centralization, reserving its application to the states. In practice then, we are arriving at the adoption of a mixed system of federalism and centralism.

On the other hand, in other aspects of government, the trend toward centralization is quite defined. Centralization is seen especially in everything having to do with the public security of the country, in matters relating to the control and management of electric energy, in the general means of communication, in the control of the waters, which have gradually been coming under federal control within the Republic, and with the irrigation works which have been constructed for the purpose of solving that very important problem in Mexico. Where these activities are concerned, the central authorities reserve full power of management and organization.

A very important aspect of our organization is that concerned with public education. In principle, education, especially primary education, should be reserved to the separate states of the Republic but in recent years, this principle has been abandoned, not so much because of any wish on the part of the Federal Government to impose itself in the matter of education, but rather in accordance with an understanding and an agreement between the Federation and the states.

Faced with the very great need in our country of solving the problem of public education, especially among our rural peoples and our indigenous races, and faced with the impossibility on the part of the states to assume complete responsibility for such education, the Federal Government decided to take the matter into its own hands and to complement within the states the work of the states in education. The inability of the states to cope with the country's educational problem is due, more than to any other cause, to the fact that they lack economic resources. On the other hand, the lack of responsibility on the part of the municipal authorities and their proneness to delay and put off certain of their duties which seem for the moment less urgent, together with their lack of economic resources has resulted in a tendency on the part of the states to centralize some of their functions, especially that of education, to unify it and see that it pro-

gresses in a uniform manner. And, in fact, as regards education, an activity so noble and of such vital interest for the entire country, no problem has arisen to hinder or interfere with the adopted program of joint effort in this field.

Fundamental coördination tends to unite the action and the resources of the local and federal authorities in a problem of common education. In carrying out its program of education, the Federation seeks to avoid any duplication of effort, and keeps always as its goal a coöperation between the states and the Federation which will make the work of the local as well as the federal schools mutually complementary in so far as the ultimate aim is concerned and within the minimum program of education established by the Federation. And lastly, with reference to intensifying educational activity, the Federal Government of Mexico is principally interested in developing rural schools, the fundamental program of which is primary education, adapted to the needs and concerned with the real orientations of our rural masses. Without neglecting the educational aspect, the program of the rural school endeavors to give the children of our peasant classes the preparation which will be useful to them in their struggle to gain a livelihood.

The Federal Government is also especially interested in secondary education as a means of raising the cultural level of the country.

Vocational and technical education is given preferential attention, the predominant characteristic of our vocational, technical schools being, of necessity, in keeping with their purpose, that of preparing the general mass of our social classes for a practical job and to make their struggle for a living easier.

In dealing with the general scope of federal action, it is opportune to point out here the ever-increasing activities the Federation is developing in national highways and in irrigation. As I explained to you earlier in this address, the activities of the states are practically confined within their own boundaries. In carrying out such nationwide programs as those of highways and irrigation, an authority superior to all of them was needed to coördinate the activities of the separate state. The problem of national irrigation involves very interesting and special points mainly having to do with the necessity of equalizing in the best possible manner the development of the coun-

try's agricultural areas. Considering the enormous extent of the natural zones of our Republic and the great irregularity of the rainfall in the various sections of Mexico, the Government has had to face the problem of irrigation on a large scale; great dams and reservoirs for the storage of water have been constructed by the Federal Government.

A résumé of our present situation and organization may be expressed in the following terms:

An extraordinary and definite power over the states exists, in fact, due in the first place to the Federation's economic predominance, and to its better organization with respect to the control and maintenance of the public forces. With respect to causes of local character inherent in the states themselves or connected with them, there is the impossibility on the part of the states themselves to arrive at any proper coördination one with the other because of the fact of their organization as independent units; the impoverished economic situation in most of the states due to the predominance of the Federal Government; the lack of organization and of technical elements within the states sufficiently prepared to solve the country's general problems; in many cases, the indolence on the part of local authorities in attending to the public's needs or the impossibility and, in some cases, the incapacity of the municipalities to attend efficiently to needs just beyond those pertaining to their immediate jurisdiction; and to the arbitrary form in which the states of the Republic were constituted in obedience to no reasons or basis of historical, physical or national character, but rather to local development.

Moreover, the aforementioned conditions have been greatly strengthened in two additional considerations, the first having to do with the urgency of implanting a uniform progress within the country, the second due to the undeniable fitness of maintaining the national unity as a means not only of safeguarding the international personality of Mexico but of assuring the formation of a life and a soul essentially national.

Our federal system has the following characteristics: Legislative centralization which reserves to the states its application, the most characteristic branches, as we have said, being those dealing with labor and land; Centralism in the field of natural resources,—that is to say in matters referring to lands, water, petroleum and mines,—

reserving in these cases, in so far as the economic part is concerned, some participation to the states; federal economic predominancy due to the fact that the Federation controls the best sources of taxation and to the very important tendency of establishing arrangements with the different states whereby they limit themselves in various fields of activity; federalization of certain activities which because of their very nature take on the character of public services throughout the country.

Some of the considerations I have brought out here with respect to the Federal Government's relation to the states are in turn applicable in a limited way to the relations existing between the state governments and those of the municipalities.

As consequence of the situation as I have explained it to you, the most delicate as well as the most ample coördination and adjustment in the relations between the federal and state authorities has become a necessity.

As a final conclusion of my talk, we may say that the relations between the states and the Federal Government in Mexico are characterized by a system of mixed federalism and centralism adapted to our political, social and physical medium and in accordance with a method which seems to us to offer the best assurance for a uniform and progressive development throughout the country.

XI

**RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES
AND MEXICO**

ROBERTO A ESTEVA RUIZ is a distinguished lawyer from Mexico City and an authority on international law.

A LATIN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

ROBERTO A ESTEVA RUIZ

As I AM addressing a group of distinguished persons who are here to determine the causes for the differences of opinion between the point of view of the United States and that of Latin America, I hope that what I say may not be a source of irritation to those who hear me, as my words are inspired by a feeling of sincerity in bringing the facts to you.

In practice the antagonistic circumstances that have arisen as a result of the Monroe Doctrine have been confused by the peoples of the Latin American countries with a series of problems that have arisen as a result of interchange between the United States and Latin America. It is a technical error to confuse the Monroe Doctrine with Pan-Americanism and the political and economic hegemony of the United States in Latin America. It is a fact that the rectification of the Monroe Doctrine will not solve the problems between the United States and Latin America. These problems are far deeper and have more far-reaching roots than are reached by the Monroe Doctrine.

On December 2, 1823, President Monroe sent a message to Congress because of the Russian activities in the West and because of the activities of the Holy Alliance in Europe, which supported Spain in trying to regain its possessions in America. The Russian activities in the West explain the first principle of the Monroe Doctrine, the principle of non-colonization. The activities of the Holy Alliance in Europe explain the second principle of the Monroe Doctrine, the principle of non-intervention. The Monroe Doctrine endeavored to safeguard the

young American republics from intervention by European powers. If these principles are rightly interpreted, we may say that the principle of non-intervention was not only for the purpose of safeguarding the democratic principles of equal rights among the Latin American republics but also for the sake of preventing the Holy Alliance from establishing monarchical and autocratic principles in the Latin American republics.

At first sight it is difficult to realize how it was possible for such a doctrine as this to convert itself into a doctrine of intervention on the part of the United States within the Latin American republics. I find the explanation for this conversion of the doctrine in the economic transformation of the United States and the Latin American republics. From 1823 to 1914 the United States was debtor to the powers of Europe for a sum fluctuating between four and five thousand millions of dollars. On the other hand, the various countries of Latin America were debtors to the United States during this same period for two thousand millions of dollars. In other words, the United States was creditor to the Latin American countries for this amount, while it was debtor to Europe for four or five thousand millions of dollars. The balance was against the United States. It is a practical principle in finance and commerce that the creditor will do everything to prevent a debtor from becoming poorer and, on the other hand, to prevent the debtor from accepting obligations from other creditors. In other words, he endeavors to keep so far as possible the solvency of the debtor in such a way that it will not prevent him from covering his obligations.

Therefore, the United States was interested in preventing Latin America from becoming a debtor to the European powers and on the other hand, it was interested in having the Latin American nations become organized and because of peaceful conditions to progress sufficiently so that they might meet their obligations. The United States then found itself obliged to intervene in Latin American affairs in order to prevent the European powers from intervening in the Latin American countries. On the other hand, we face historical fact, and we cannot deny that during this same period, this last century and a half, the Latin American countries have found themselves in constant revolutionary turmoil, which has upset their eco-

nomic progress and development. The United States has been very much upset because of this economic unbalance on the part of the Latin American nations. This new economic orientation of the Monroe Doctrine may be summarized in a passage from Benjamin H. Williams of the University of Pennsylvania (*Economic Foreign Policy of the United States*):

"The Monroe Doctrine is sometimes used to defend economic policies in Latin America which have no logical relation to the ideas of Monroe. The notion of Manifest Destiny has been used as a colossal smoke screen to obscure or conceal the multitude of economic gains that have been part and parcel of expansion. Reciprocity, sometimes forced from others by means of penalty tariffs, was said by James G. Blaine in 1890 to be in accordance with international justice. The doctrine of equality, which is today practiced by the United States and which is sometimes stressed diplomatically for the purpose of preventing reciprocity among other nations which will endanger American commerce, is explained by Secretary Kellogg as embodying the only fair notion of trade. The two doctrines are based on contrary principles. The purpose of urging each through diplomatic means has been the expansion of markets for American goods, and the original method used in the time of Blaine has lately been reserved to fit a new situation created by economic evolution. To describe either as rising out of a respect advantage is certain to contribute to confused thinking."

The policy of the United States has been to impose upon Latin America, either through conviction or through force, its political order in order that thereby it might gain the economic order. How is it possible then to reconcile such a technique with the principles of internationalism? Public law clearly states the equality of nations and the policy of non-interference of one nation in the interior affairs of another. The only possible way to explain this is that because of the possibility of intervention from a European power the United States appealing to the Monroe Doctrine would be free to intervene in Latin American affairs. The Latin American countries which could not and did not rightly interpret this policy of non-intervention on the part of the United States, naturally in the cases of intervention interpreted such a move as similar to the policy of American hegemony. And so there developed two main currents or tendencies, one

on the part of the Latin American States to develop the so-called "Pan-Latinism" and the other in the United States to develop an association of all the American nations, which has been called "Pan-Americanism."

I could prove this thesis by extensive quotations, but I will limit myself to one quotation from the distinguished internationalist and jurist, Alexander Alvarez, of Chile, who has said that true Pan-Americanism consists in the association of all of the American nations under the hegemony of the United States.

"The notion of continental American solidarity, enfeebled for a long time, reappears today and imposes itself. It includes all of the states of the new continent without distinction of races, the Latins as well as the Anglo-Saxons. There exists now an American conscience which unites the independent states of the two hemispheres, already jealous of each other, which makes them understand each other, and they are united under the leadership of the United States. This American conscience, or Pan-Americanism, is contrary to the general European idea of solidarity, which implies the union of a single state, or of all the peoples of the same race, or a union of the interests of all the states of the continent to which these races belong."

In Europe, according to Dr. Alvarez, Pan-Europeanism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Latinism mean the association of all of the European countries, of all the Slavic countries, of all the Latin countries. But in America, Pan-Americanism means the association of all of the American countries under the hegemony of the United States.

Dr. Alvarez in a book published in 1928 called "The Pan-Americanism in the Sixth Pan-American Conference," still insists on this view and sets forth three principles. The first is the material solidarity of the Pan-American countries, which is based on the geographic conditions and the commercial and economic forces between these countries. The second principle is based on moral solidarity, which is, in turn, based on the feeling on the part of the Latin American countries that the United States may serve for them as an example of political and economic organization. But this same moral solidarity is based on the feeling on the part of both the United States and the Latin American countries that their institutions must be safeguarded

and must be defended against the encroachment of the European powers. In support of this thesis Dr. Alvarez quotes from the speech made by Secretary Hughes before the Chamber of Commerce at Havana at the time of the sixth Pan-American Conference held in that city, and from this speech he draws the conclusion that Pan-Americanism rests on four columns: (1) the independence of all of the states in America; (2) the political stability of these states; (3) good will; (4) coöperation.

In regard to the first principle Secretary Hughes said: "Independence is not sufficient. It is necessary that all of the states of the new world should have political stability. . . . It is the desire of the United States to have political stability, and if the United States has intervened in Santo Domingo it is only with the purpose of insuring this political stability."

I believe, therefore, that the interpretation that Alexander Alvarez has given to the doctrine of Pan-Americanism is true. Pan-Americanism should be that association of nations under the hegemony of the United States so that in case it is found necessary to enforce one of the columns of Pan-Americanism the United States will be free to interfere and ensure this political stability in any other of the American countries.

One of the greatest opponents of Alvarez is Mr. Sâ Vianna, an internationalist of note of Rio de Janeiro. In connection with this doctrine of Alexander Alvarez he asks whether Saxon-Americanism is an integral part of Pan-Americanism, based on the same principle as Latin Americanism. And he answers that it is not. He considers that Pan-Americanism and Latin Americanism are two dangerous doctrines. In the first place, Pan-Americanism is dangerous because it refers to the absorption of twenty states by one of them and, secondly, Latin Americanism is dangerous because it is platonic and inefficient.

In today's papers there is a telegram from the *New York Times* which expresses the official view in Washington regarding the Monroe Doctrine. It says that henceforth the Monroe Doctrine will not be interpreted by the United States except in terms strictly in accordance with the principles enunciated by its originator. This rectification of the Monroe Doctrine, as I said in the beginning, will prevent in

the future the confusion between the original Monroe Doctrine and the many sources of antagonism between the United States and Latin America, but it will not prevent these antagonisms in Latin America.

It is little known that in the early history of these nations Mexico endeavored to obtain the control and domination of Cuba in order to prevent the United States from gaining that domination, and that the United States, knowing of these activities of Mexico, endeavored to counteract them. It is also little known that in the Congresses of Panama and of Tacubaya, invoked respectively by Bolívar and Alaman, the United States refused to take part because, as they instructed their delegates, it would be useless to endeavor to become associated with countries of different religion, with Spanish tradition and points of view totally different from those of the United States. Therefore, its delegates should be in these congresses as mere observers. The object of these congresses was to work out a means whereby these nations might be duly associated and united to prevent through material and cultural relations intervention on the part of Europe, instead of a mere enunciation of principles, such as President Monroe had given.

I am going to quote some interesting documents that bear on three principal questions: (1) the activities of Mexico looking toward the domination of Cuba; (2) the activities of the United States to gain possession of Cuba; (3) the activities of Mexico to obtain from England the aid and help to prevent the United States from interfering in its desire to take possession of Cuba. This is a note (1824) from the delegate of Mexico in London regarding these activities:

"With regard to the Isle of Cuba, this question becomes every day more important. As you may have seen in the public papers, the disposition of the United States towards the pirates is of such a nature that it is not addressing itself to any other objective than to open hostilities against Spain, counting upon the weakness of this power and the favor of the party in power in the Isle of Cuba for the United States. This will not properly become a fact without grief on the part of England. It is believed that in the case of the liberator of Colombia, when he has finished his campaign in Peru he will endeavor to bring all of his forces and all of his effort to gain possession of Cuba and Porto Rico. In these circumstances it is clear that the policy that should be followed by the government of Mexico is that it should endeavor to obtain control of the

Isle of Cuba as a possession, or that at least it should be made independent in order that not one of Mexico's neighbors might obtain advantage of such a wealthy possession."¹

The next passage is from a report of the interview of the delegate of Mexico with Premier Canning of England. Mr. Canning said that England would see with a great deal of disgust the taking of possession of Cuba by either France or the United States, and he let it be understood that Mexico would be considered with favor by the British Cabinet if it should take possession of that Island.

We see, then, that from the very beginning of Pan-Americanism there have developed antagonistic tendencies between the United States and the Latin American countries. These tendencies I do not believe will be rectified during the present time or for many centuries to come because of the differences of economic desires and objectives on the part of the two peoples. It is very difficult to expect that peoples of different countries should have the same ideals and the same economic situations and the same views. There are two kinds of solidarity, mechanical and organic. The first type of solidarity is the one that they have endeavored to establish, and that solidarity means a similarity of economic conditions, of thought, of aspirations of the different peoples. I believe that first type is not convenient, because different countries and different states should follow their own destiny and should develop in accordance with their traditions and desires and objectives. I am an admirer of North American culture, but I believe that it would be wrong for Mexico to accept and adopt that North American culture. Mexico has a mission to perform and Mexico should develop not along North American lines, but along its own lines. It should contribute its due share to the welfare of the world and thereby bring to the world and to the understanding of nations its own peculiar genius. I believe that organic solidarity will come in nations as they develop along their own lines, and that it will come more or less in the same way that it comes in a country made up perhaps of different peoples having different characteristics, by each one of them contributing toward the welfare and organic whole of that nation. Then it will be possible for the different coun-

¹ *La Diplomacia Mexicana*—Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, Mexico, Vol. 3, p. 103, ed. 1913.

tries to be fully developed, to understand each other, and to bring about this organic solidarity to which I have referred.

VICENTE LOMBARDO TOLEDANO, lawyer and labor leader,
is the author of "*La Libertad Sindical en México*."

MONROE DOCTRINE AND IMPERIALISM

VICENTE LOMBARDO TOLEDANO

IF THE message of President Monroe of December, 1823, had been enunciated by a president of a small state of limited geographic extension, it is possible that not even the relatives of the president would today remember that message. Not only that, if this message of President Monroe had been addressed to his congress not in the beginning of the 19th century, but in the beginning of the 15th century, it is probable that it would not have had any importance. The United States is placed in a privileged spot on the globe from the standpoint of its economic condition, and now possesses the greatest wealth of any country. With these conditions and because of modern industrial development the United States has followed a course that has led it to a fatal situation, because of the historic conditions which have surrounded this development. As the distinguished persons who hear me well know, the present industrial activity has been brought about because of the amassing of capital, because of the employment of machinery and because of the development in technique which makes possible mass production. The United States, because of its ability to develop its scientific resources which it has elaborated since the 18th century, is beginning to develop in an extraordinary fashion.

The United States, because of these conditions which I have outlined, will continue to develop in the same way as other countries which have possessed great natural resources, which have accumulated them and gradually expended them, and the United States will come to its fatal destiny. The United States has advanced a great deal further in the process than England, which before the United States had achieved the greatest development of any country. Modern history divides itself, to my way of thinking, into two main parts: the first part covers Germany and England from the Battle of Trafalgar to the Treaty of Versailles, and the second to the United States since the Treaty of Peace at Versailles. In other words, the United States would have to follow a policy of expansion and development of economic domination whether or not President Monroe had ever enunciated his famous doctrine.

The best demonstration of this principle lies in the fact that there are no two opinions that are the same on the part of the American government with regard to the Monroe Doctrine. However, they are of one accord when it comes to using this message of President Monroe in favor of economic expansion. To my mind, of all of the American presidents who have expressed an opinion as to the Monroe Doctrine, the one who has done it best was the illustrious President Roosevelt, because he spoke with great sincerity and clearness. We, the Latin American peoples, have the sad experience that that which has been said by President Roosevelt has been exactly the truth, whereas that which has been said in this respect by other presidents, particularly President Wilson, has not been true. I shall quote from the message of President Roosevelt, his fourth message to Congress, December 6, 1904:

"It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards the other nations of the Western Hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous. Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, it need fear no interference from the United States. Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results

in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power. If every country washed by the Caribbean Sea would show the progress in stable and just civilization which with the aid of the Platt Amendment Cuba has shown since our troops left the island, and which so many of the republics in both Americas are constantly and brilliantly showing, all question of interference by this Nation with their affairs would be at an end."

As the words of President Roosevelt were nothing but an enunciation of a policy of expansion on the part of the United States in Latin America, there is a feeling among many Mexicans, at least those included in the working classes, of which I am a part, that the Monroe Doctrine is nothing but one of the many subterfuges which have been used by the United States in its imperialistic policy of expansion. The United States, like other countries that are growing and developing, is in need at the present time of raw materials, of good highways, of markets both for the absorption of its products and the investment of its capital, and the experience of the Latin American nations is that we are nothing but highways, nothing but fields for raw materials which they need, nothing but markets for the absorption of their products and fields for the investment of their capital.

In a book entitled *Investments of United States Capital in Latin America*, there is a foreword by my good friend Dr. Leo S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan-American Union, in which he states that there has been a favorable change, both as to the personnel and methods used by those investing capital in Latin America. He says further that during the last twenty-five years those operating businesses in Latin America have come to realize that national good will is an important factor in the success of their undertaking. This new spirit is evident in the improved housing conditions and higher wages enjoyed by employes, in improved educational facilities and in setting a standard which is making these industries welcome guests in the countries in which they operate.

Unfortunately these words of Dr. Rowe are not exact. The opposite

is true. I can only speak with reference to Mexico and with my experience with the labor movement of which I am a part. The salaries paid to the workers by the American concerns in Mexico are lower than the salaries paid to workers in similar industries promoted by capital of non-American origin. The housing conditions for Mexican workmen in American owned industries are in general of a poorer type than those enjoyed by the Mexican workmen in other industries of the same type. But this is not the most serious aspect. Those who oppose constantly the legislation in favor of workmen are the representatives of American capital in Mexico. American capital in Mexico prefers to call on the American Embassy in order to bring about the solution of questions regarding the control of workmen in Mexico rather than to adjust itself to the legislation on the case.

Lack of sympathy in regard to American capital in Mexico is such that today capital from European sources, even though it may have the same imperialistic motives as other capital, is looked upon with greater favor than capital coming from North America. It is not my purpose to point out any particular industry. Nevertheless it might be well to note that in the policy of higher salaries in industrial development, of which Henry Ford has been one of the originators and foremost exponents, that policy is not only not followed in Mexico, but the agency has brought about a constant opposition toward legislation for the worker.

Therefore, the experience of the Mexican workmen with regard to the expansion of the United States is that Mexico presents a fine field for raw materials, such as minerals, oil and woods, that it presents a market for the absorption of the manufactured goods of the United States and a field for the investment of American capital. We have indeed confirmed the words of President Roosevelt.

My present opinion regarding the Monroe Doctrine is that this doctrine as a simple thesis in law has no importance whatsoever because it is a declaration of unilateral value. It forms part of the Treaty of the Peace of Versailles. In other words, the United States had it put into the Treaty of Peace so that the other nations would accept the principle that its influence in the Western Hemisphere was absolute. However, in the month of September of last year the Council of the League of Nations declared that the value of the Monroe Doc-

trine was the value that might be given to it by the Latin American nations. Naturally the Latin American nations, Mexico included, have already declared that the Monroe Doctrine has no importance because it is a declaration that is unilateral.

What I really consider of most importance is the development of the capitalistic interest and imperialism of the United States in Latin America. I wish to quote from an article written by my good friend, Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, in the *Atlantic Monthly* of July, 1924, entitled *Imperialistic America*.

"No one can be opposed to legitimate business with our neighbors. On the contrary it is vital and concerns us all. But the continuation of a unilateral diplomacy, with its combination of bonds and warships signifies the destruction of our nation as surely as that of Egypt, Rome, of Spain, of Germany, and of all other nations that measure their development by material possessions instead of applying the yardstick of love, of justice, and welfare of their neighbors."

We in Mexico, I the first one, do not wish the disappearance of the United States, but we do wish the disappearance in the United States, in England, in Mexico and in other countries of the imperialistic régime, of the capitalistic tendencies. That is to say, we believe that the people in the United States are at the present time the victims of the imperialistic economic condition of the bourgeois régime which has expanded so rapidly, in the same way that we ourselves believe that we are victims of the same imperialistic and capitalistic imposition, whether it comes from the United States, from England, or any other country.

I wish to say in conclusion that we in Mexico welcome the visit of workmen, whether they be manual workmen or intellectual workmen, from other countries who have at heart a desire for justice among the peoples. We in Mexico, manual workmen and intellectual workmen, have been fighting these battles with an earnest desire to bring about social justice.

CHESTER LLOYD JONES, *director of the School of Commerce, University of Wisconsin; Commercial Attaché, Havana and Paris; Special Representative from the United States Department of Commerce to Mexico; author of "Caribbean Interests of the United States"; "Mexico and Its Reconstruction"; with Fred J. Rippey and Parker T. Moon, "The United States and the Caribbean."*

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—A DEFENSE

CHESTER LLOYD JONES

SELDOM are symposia held under the title of the Monroe Doctrine ones which are closely confined to the subject to which they nominally refer. In this they are like most other symposia, but discussions on our subject of today always tend to run far afield because there is no general agreement on what the Monroe Doctrine is, or rather it has been so embroidered by its friends and critics that the original cloth is often hardly visible.

This has been the case this morning and perhaps I myself shall be guilty of the same error in what I say on the subject. We have heard discussed labor conditions in Mexico and the expansion of the investment of American capital in the world as consequences of the Monroe Doctrine though certainly its author could have had no such factors even remotely in mind when its clauses were penned. We have heard discussed also certain of the general political and economic circumstances which have arisen in the New World, which would exist if the Monroe Doctrine had never been issued and which would continue to exist if today the United States should declare that its policy would no longer be opposed to European colonization of the New World.

Thus the Monroe Doctrine is presented to us as the factor which

destroys equality among the American states and puts them under the hegemony of the United States. Now when the word "equality" is used in describing the relations of nations to each other it must be used in a very special sense. Neither the Monroe Doctrine nor the lack of the Monroe Doctrine can make all American states in all respects equal.

No two states are equal, as a matter of fact. There must be great differences between England and Belgium, between Salvador and the United States. In political affairs the only sort of equality we can hope for is that equality which exists in the ballot. And even that, as we see in the organization of the League of Nations, is not fully accepted in even the most recent of international relations. In economic affairs in turn there can be equality in that each state can determine its own policy, but that is about all. Absolute equality on all points is not achievable. We must expect as a consequence that the United States will have in America greater economic influence than states with small resources and greater political influence than states of smaller and less advanced populations. When we are talking about equality, therefore, we must qualify our meaning of that word.

There was some comment to the effect that the growth of the economic strength of the United States is unacceptable to the Latin American countries. It is difficult to believe that this is really the case, for Latin American countries have profited by the growth of the economic strength of the northern Republic. The United States is not only the greatest source of the goods needed in practically every one of the Latin American countries, except Paraguay, but is the greatest market for the goods that these countries have to sell. In this connection let me mention one other factor not given enough importance.

The trade policy of the United States we have heard criticized. What has been the trade policy of the United States toward Latin America? Is it one subject to criticism, one that has kept these countries in positions of inferiority regarding their shipments of goods; have there been imposed upon them trade policies they would not otherwise have adopted; or has the trade policy of the United States in any other way coerced them in their commercial or general economic development? Neither do such conditions now exist nor have they ever existed. Even under our present tariff conditions regarded as inde-

fensible by so many, Latin American nations stand in a peculiarly favorable position. Four-fifths of all the imports that are sent us from their ports come in not at low rates of duty, but without a single cent of duty being paid. On less than half of one per cent of all that goes to the United States from northern South America, Colombia and Venezuela, is anything paid. Our trade policy toward Latin America has been and is, not only a generous one, but one which constitutes the United States a great free trade market for them. Our tariffs are far more liberal toward Latin American countries than toward others, far more liberal than those of their chief European customers toward them and—be it said in passing—far lower on their goods sent to us than are theirs on the goods we send to them.

While these are circumstances affecting our general relations they are ones which have only a distant relation to the Monroe Doctrine.

The Monroe Doctrine was not a long-planned declaration, not one formally adopted by the United States government. It has developed from a declaration made at first not by a strong nation, but by one of the weaker powers. It has developed in influence as the position of that nation has developed, and it has been given a meaning by some of those who have cited it which it did not have in the beginning, and does not have now. In essence the so-called Monroe Doctrine was and is merely a declaration that the United States is opposed to further European colonization of the new world. It is the doctrine of America for Americans.

It is interesting to notice what the attitudes of the various nations of the New World have been toward the Monroe Doctrine at different periods. There sometimes seems to be common agreement in the United States that Latin America opposes the Monroe Doctrine and has always done so. I wish there were time for me to mention different cases in which this has not been the case. There is hardly one of the Latin American countries that has not at some time or other felt the benefits of the Monroe Doctrine and cases are not few in which certain of them have themselves sought to have its meaning expanded beyond the original terms.

But time is too short to detail the cases when the countries of Latin America have declared themselves anxious to benefit from the fact that the Monroe Doctrine has been in existence. Let us turn to the

other side of the picture. Has the Monroe Doctrine worked to the advantage or disadvantage of Latin America? Has it brought about the crushing of weak states or given them a chance to develop their strength?

Take a globe of the world representing the political divisions of a century ago. Spin it around and note where the weak states are found in America and the other continents. Now take another showing present-day divisions and make a similar review. What does one see? The weak states of Europe, of Asia, of Africa have almost all disappeared. They have been absorbed by stronger powers or brought into the position of "colonies" by the "imperialism" of European nations.

But in America such absorption has not occurred. The new republics have grown stronger. There is around the Caribbean a group which still is weak. Elsewhere the new American nations have more fully found themselves but even these weaker ones have had their chance to develop their nationalities for a hundred years,—and they have it still!

On any fair review must it not be concluded that this policy of the state which has become the strongest in America declaring that it will oppose European colonization has contributed mightily to the survival of the weak states, the counterparts of which have elsewhere in the world disappeared. And is not this policy one of continuing benefit to them, creating conditions which may enable the least favored of them to advance as the stronger states of Latin America have advanced? One by one as these states have advanced interference by foreign powers in their affairs has dwindled. To these states which have become strong, the application of the Monroe Doctrine has become largely theoretical. It has become theoretical because conditions have changed. But has it become a dead letter to those who still stand in a position less strong?

Let us look at things from the practical point of view. This situation in which the Monroe Doctrine now has little practical application does not exist everywhere in America. There are still states to the south of us in which European countries feel prompted to interfere from time to time to insure the rights of their citizens and to protect their property interests. We need only to look over the period

from 1900 to see in how many cases we have actually had European nations getting troops on shore. In that period troops have been put ashore by the French, by Germans, by Italians and even by the peace-loving Dutch, to protect their interests. Indeed the cases where we have had troops of European powers ashore would doubtless have been more numerous than they have been but for the fact that the United States has in numerous cases asked that they be not landed.

We land our troops under certain circumstances. I don't think that any of us like to have that done. It is an unwelcome position to be in—interfering in the affairs of another country. The greater part of the American public would feel very much pleased if that sort of thing were never done, or, better, that conditions never arose which necessitated its being done.

If one takes the history of the other weak states the world around that have disappeared it seems to show that the landing of troops announced as temporary has frequently, one may almost say as a rule, developed into a permanent occupation and resulted in the disappearance of the nation. The record of American intervention is one which stands in decided contrast. We intervened in Cuba, and later withdrew. We intervened in Santo Domingo and withdrew. We still have troops in Nicaragua and Haiti. Ninety-nine per cent of the people in the United States are sorry to have them there. We are going to get them out as soon as we can.

I wonder whether in cases where it is to be done there might not be a certain amount of agreement among Latin American countries and ourselves that it is better to have American troops ashore temporarily than to have European troops ashore, perhaps temporarily. At least if one takes the record of what has happened after American intervention, one has some assurance that in future cases of intervention, if unhappily such there be, the United States will withdraw its troops as soon as conditions warrant this action.

We are, after all, faced by a condition and not by a theory, a situation in which what we should hope for is that we can coöperate with these states south of us, to develop the very interchanges that have been criticized, interchanges that will allow these countries to produce greater and greater quantities of goods for export and domestic use, to buy more and more from us, to establish better standards of

life, to establish better economic conditions, to make it possible to have better roads and better education.

It is better to work with these countries to bring about these conditions so that chaos which in the weaker ones threatens at times not only the local population but all foreign interests shall disappear. That sort of development has already eliminated most of these countries south of us from the possibility of any intervention. If it goes on I have confidence that you will find all Latin American countries becoming ones which discharge their obligations in international affairs and in which no occasion will arise to upset that order which they are expected to maintain under the rules of international law.

There is not any reason for being pessimistic about the relations between the United States and Latin America. From an economic standpoint we are their greatest buyers, and they, in turn are one of our best markets. Our exchanges with them in 1929 reached a total of more than a billion dollars each way. They want to draw closer to us economically, and the bonds that have been developing between us have brought interdependence much more to the forefront than any questions of intervention which may at times cause friction between us.

As time goes on we may see this last group of weak American states graduate from the position in which they stand, as we have done, as Argentina has done and the other stable states of Latin America. Then you will find the Monroe Doctrine no longer "acted on" and you will find liberally minded people saying that the United States has changed its practice.

We will not have changed our practice. We will not be involved, let us hope, in "interventions" but that will be due to the fact that the conditions that formerly prompted intervention will have passed away. American policy will not have changed. We shall still be defenders of America for Americans' policy though under the new circumstances which will have come into existence we will no longer, let us hope, find exceptional measures necessary to defend it. All of the states of the New World will then be defenders of the Monroe Doctrine.

SAMUEL GUY INMAN, executive director of the Committee on Coöperation in Latin America; editor of "La Nueva Democracia"; author of "Intervention in Mexico," "Problems in Pan Americanism," "Trailing the Conquistadores"; lecturer, Columbia University, University of Chile, University of Mexico.

THE FUTURE OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

SAMUEL GUY INMAN

WE HAVE heard a great international lawyer who has referred in a most enlightened way to the historical development of the Monroe Doctrine. Then we have had one of those warm-blooded young Mexicans who sees the Monroe Doctrine only in terms of the imperialism of the United States. This attitude is one that is absolutely dominant today. A great juggernaut is coming down toward us and it is rolling over us. And what a few of us have got to do, reformers everywhere, is to get together and stop this tremendous juggernaut, with its capitalistic system that will oppress us all.

I was much interested to read in the papers that a senator from Texas is running on the platform that Texas will not be bossed by Wall Street. It is not only Mexico that fears Wall Street—it is all of us!

What Dr. Jones said about the Monroe Doctrine reminds me of a famous scientist who was making an experiment as to whether he could teach lions and lambs to live in the same room. When asked how they were getting along the scientist said, "Splendidly, except that I have to replace the lamb every once in a while!"

This is exactly what has happened on the American continent. Our Latin American friends refer to the history of the United States and its geographic extension. They say that the United States began

with thirteen original colonies, a thin strip along the Atlantic seaboard. Next we made a little bargain with Napoleon and stepped over to the Mississippi. Following that we had a few words with Spain and came into the possession of Florida. A little later there arose disagreeable words in a three-cornered dispute with Mexico and Texas, out of which we came with our territory having extended to the Pacific Ocean. In 1898 Cuba was being abused. To free her we went to war with Spain and some way or other we came out of that war in possession of the Philippines and Porto Rico. Of course we gave Cuba her freedom, with the exception of a few minor details written in the Platt amendment, which gave us the right to intervene and said that Cuba could not sell any of her territory, giving us a naval base and guaranteeing us that she would conduct a government for the protection of life and property, we being the judges in the case. ✓

Following that we landed our collector of customs in Santo Domingo. In 1915 we landed troops in Haiti. We have tried to get them out—I think we will—but they are still there. We landed troops in Santo Domingo and simply declared that the president and his cabinet would not be paid their salaries until they agreed with a treaty we desired them to sign. The salaries were stopped for a considerable length of time. For some eight years the ruler of Santo Domingo was a rear admiral of the United States Navy, and his word was law. We withdrew our troops, but we still have our collector of tariffs in Santo Domingo and the word of the American ambassador in Santo Domingo is of considerable importance. The question of digging a canal came up. We took the Panama Canal Zone. There were some difficulties, but while Congress was still debating the question, the canal was built.

In 1912 we landed troops in Nicaragua. All but one hundred were removed. These hundred were removed in 1928 for thirteen months, then they were back again.

We have collectors of customs, financial advisers, etc. in various countries of Latin America. This is the way it looks to the Latin American. That is the reason—and we can understand why it should be true—that the Latin American simply takes the Monroe Doctrine and puts it all together and says that is what it means. It means that

Europe must stay out of America so that the United States may go into Latin America. I myself do not believe that that is the idea of the Monroe Doctrine. I think we ought to try to get in mind what the Monroe Doctrine really is. When you talk about doctrines of any sort there are two sides always. There is the doctrine as a sentiment and you can raise a Presbyterian or a Roman Catholic or any other theologian out of his seat if you talk about theological doctrine. Then if you want to appeal to the doctrine itself you have another side of it. That is one of the reasons why we do not get anywhere in considering the Monroe Doctrine, because on one side it is a sentiment, a sentiment of the American people. In the first place it is a sentiment of the American people because we protect ourselves by it. That is a natural sentiment and most authorities agree that it was the self-protection of America that motivated the Doctrine. It was the fear that as we were a small, weak nation those European nations would impose themselves first on the smaller countries and then on us. Unfortunately there would creep in some of that old idea of Manifest Destiny and our Latin American friends are always embarrassing me by quoting what has been said about our Manifest Destiny. Much of what has been said is foolish, but it has been brought down and translated in the newspapers. Mr. Brisbane's column, which is published in English and Spanish in the Mexican papers, contains much of this idea. We know how to take these things with grains of salt, but we cannot blame our Latin American friends. This does not have anything to do with the Monroe Doctrine whatever.

I had wanted to make a little historical study as to where we stand with reference to the Monroe Doctrine. In the United States some people think the Doctrine ought to be eliminated. Others think it ought to be clearly defined. At the present time we hear very much of a new endeavor of the Department of State to define the Monroe Doctrine. That has come out of a pamphlet which was edited by Mr. J. Reuben Clark, who is in our Embassy in Mexico City at the present time. Mr. Clark has made a very remarkable collection of documents in which one can find practically all the opinions of American presidents and secretaries of state since the beginning of the Monroe Doctrine. Mr. Clark, with three or four pages only of introduction, has made this significant statement that the Roosevelt

corollary, which was quoted here this morning and which I believe was the beginning of all of our wrong orientation in the Caribbean, is not a part of the Monroe Doctrine and should be dropped absolutely. I understand that this was simply a report to the United States Senate in order that they might consider all sides of the Kellogg Pact. They did consider it in connection with the Monroe Doctrine and the United States Senate quoted from various authorities concerning the Monroe Doctrine, all quotations tending to point out that the original Monroe Doctrine simply was in reference to America and Europe, that it had nothing whatever to do with the relations between the United States and the other American states. If we can get that clearly stated it will be of great value. It will not settle our problems, but it will eliminate a great deal of misunderstanding about the Doctrine. Whether Mr. Clark's pamphlet will be accepted officially and be announced around America as the press says it will remains to be seen. Anyway, the very fact that it was published by the Department of State and has been given publicity is of importance.

There is a rather discouraging thing on the other hand about the most recent developments of the Doctrine and that is that since 1928 we have concluded about twenty different bilateral treaties with non-American countries and I believe in each one of these new treaties we have inserted a protective Monroe Doctrine clause, saying more or less that we will not arbitrate questions that have to do with the Monroe Doctrine. While this other movement is of great encouragement, yet the fact that at the same time we have for the first time in these bilateral treaties introduced this new definition or protection of the Monroe Doctrine shows that in our country we are still more or less divided, indeed within our own government, as to the attitude we ought to take regarding this old Doctrine.

The greatest difficulty that we find ourselves in, in all this international organization is the famous Article 21 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which we North Americans do not remember was put into the Covenant although certain European countries, China, and Latin America objected strenuously. That article was put in because it was considered absolutely necessary if the United States were to adopt the Covenant. But after it had been accepted for that purpose, then what happened? We did not go into the League! Little

Salvador wrote the United States Government a note and said, "Before we sign the Covenant of the League of Nations we would like to know from you what we are signing, what the Monroe Doctrine is." This was an embarrassing moment for the Department of State. Finally it found a nice paragraph in one of President Wilson's speeches and sent that to Salvador and said, "This is the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine." Salvador, inwardly unconvinced, accepted it and went into the League. Mexico at that time made a frank declaration that she did not recognize the Monroe Doctrine. This is one of the reasons why she did not go into the League.

What are we going to do with the Monroe Doctrine? It seems clear that the future of the Monroe Doctrine will be shaped not by fiat, but by evolution. The officials of the United States government can hardly be expected to pass a solemn resolution announcing the abandonment of the Doctrine, nor can Latin American nations be expected to endorse the Doctrine. (The effort to have them do this under most auspicious circumstances at the Fourth Pan-American Congress shows the impossibility of such action.) But what will happen or should happen is that this doctrine should be absorbed in a larger, newer conception of the duties and relations of all the American States. If President Wilson's prediction that "the Monroe Doctrine will become the doctrine of the world" is not fulfilled, at least through the evolution of closer understandings and international organization, it will become the doctrine of all America.

If the Government officials are able to discern the change of conditions in the New World of today, they will see that often great national policies like the Monroe Doctrine, which may have served faithfully under former conditions, now are elements of division and should be permitted to evolve into more comprehensive international understandings and juridical organizations.

My own opinion about the Monroe Doctrine itself is illustrated by a little trip that I had to the Museum of Natural History not long ago with my son, aged nine years. We went into the Museum and saw a tremendously big animal. "Goodness," said Robert, "what's that?" "That is a dinosaur." "When did he live?" "He lived thousands and millions of years ago." "Who killed him?" "Nobody killed him. The climate changed and he died." That is what is going to happen to all

of these nationalistic covenants. The Monroe Doctrine is used technically to protect ourselves. France has her Monroe Doctrine, England has hers, and Mexico has hers. Who is going to kill them? Why, the international climate is going to change and we are a part of those who are going to change that international climate.

1.

SALVADOR URBINA, Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Mexico.

THE BASIS FOR UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

SALVADOR URBINA

To SPEAK of how to obtain a better understanding between the only two sovereign countries in North America is to admit implicitly that they have been or are in disagreement, and that the causes for disagreement are of such magnitude that it is worth while to study them and to try to secure their permanent disappearance.

No one will deny that the relations between the United States and Mexico, which now admit of an ample, fair and tolerant discussion of our international problems, have many times in the last twenty years or so assumed a menacing aspect due to the many revolutions that have taken place in Mexico since 1911, and to the changes that have been made in our constitutional laws and the subsequent execution of these laws, especially in the matter of petroleum and land rights, and more so in the matter of the prohibition of foreigners to acquire landed property in certain zones of Mexican territory. But whatever may have been the reasons for conflict it is a fact that disagreement has existed with more or less intensity during the revolutionary years,

as it is a fact also that disagreement existed in days gone long ago, culminating in such violence as the war of 1847 when Mexico lost almost half of her territory.

The question now is: "Have we today problems of such magnitude that may give origin to such intense disagreement as we have experienced in the past?" Leaving aside matters which belong properly in the jurisdiction of our respective embassies and which are not the subject of this lecture, there is no question whatsoever that there are problems highly interesting to both countries in which our respective peoples sense a source of disagreement because, instead of a common accord or common thought between the two countries, there is room for controversy in such problems.

There is in all conflicts or disagreements between two or more nations in the world a remote or initial origin. In many cases it is the geographical neighborhood; in others the economic interdependence, and both causes are in most cases determinative. There is not a single case known in the world in which two neighbor peoples have permanently enjoyed peace between themselves—from frequent conflicts of a peaceful character to long and cruel wars taking place between neighboring countries more than between those that are not neighbors, it is not necessary that such proximity be of a bordering nature. It is enough that such neighborhood or proximity be in the nature of a community of political or economic interests in a given geographical region to make such proximity a cause for disagreement between countries. Examples: France and Germany annihilated by two wars—the terrible one of 1870 and the war (for which no name can be found in any language) which took place forty or more years later; not to mention the innumerable armed conflicts which took place before the unification of Germany, and in the Middle Ages.

England and France; France and Italy; France and Spain; Russia and Japan because of their situation in Asia; the United States and Spain because of their geographical interests in Cuba; the Balkan countries between themselves; Turkey and Greece; Italy and Turkey; Austria and her neighbors; Japan and China, etc., etc., and many others, are cases that exemplify that humanity has lived and lives in constant dispute when the peoples are neighbors or when there is occasion for greater contact between them. Why be surprised, then,

when in more than one hundred and fifty years of the existence of the United States as an independent country, and one hundred and nine of the existence of Mexico as independent also, there has been only one war between them, that of 1847, and two armed aggressions, partial or local in character, in 1914 and 1916?

Besides the original geographical factors mentioned, I shall attempt to go into the principal causes that have engendered the present disagreements or controversies between both countries, and for the purpose I shall divide them into two groups: first, that of the common causes that are general in the relations of Latin America with the United States; second, the special causes in the relations with Mexico.

To affirm that the first group of causes exists is to establish that there is disagreement between the Latin American countries and the United States. Who does not know it? In numerous books and in newspaper articles not only Latin writers, but European and North American as well, speak of the antagonism between Latin America and the United States, of the future of our peoples menaced by North American imperialism, of the Monroe Doctrine as an exponent of that imperialism; of the predominance of the United States in Central America; of their intervention in South American questions; of their tariff disputes with Argentina; of the handicaps of Pan-Americanism.

What is at the bottom of these disagreements? It would be difficult, indeed, to establish a general rule for all the countries in Latin America. Neither in their historical antecedents nor in their diverse economic developments, nor because of their geographical situation, have they all causes for disagreement, but, in the measure that progress and civilization bring them closer and closer in contact with the United States, there can be clearly perceived facts that place the latter country in a special position as to aims and tendencies with regard to the other twenty Latin American countries.

We have, first, that the language constitutes an immediate cause for misunderstanding. As long as the Latins of our continent are unable to speak the English language, and the Saxons (of the American continent also) are unable to speak the Spanish language, it will be difficult for their respective governments to obtain such an intellectual and commercial interchange that will result in a closer knowledge and understanding of each other, and in the compre-

hension of their common needs and their common problems. My distinguished friend, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, in his book "The Relations of the United States with the Other Nations of the Western Hemisphere" (pages 14 and 15), says that the obstacle of the language should by no means be seen as one of minor importance, and admits that among the Latins the study of the English language is increasing, while the study of the Spanish language by the North Americans is quite insignificant. With more thought it will be easy to establish the far-reaching importance that the difference in the language has in the rapprochement of our peoples. The press, that great lever of human progress, does not perform to the fullest extent its far-reaching mission of spreading knowledge among the various peoples and contributing to the understanding of each other and of their aspirations, their needs, and their problems, because it is stopped in its work by the difference in the language. To encourage and spread the use of the Spanish and the English languages will be, therefore, a means of rapprochement between the peoples of the United States and of Latin America.

In the second place, and much more difficult to overcome, we have the obstacle of racial prejudice. Notwithstanding the keenness of observation and the liberality of mind of which the people of the United States have given proof in their literary and scientific works, they have not yet been able to rid themselves of certain racial prejudices which produce unfortunate results in their relations with Latin America, and especially so in their relations with Mexico. I refer to the contempt with which the Latin American is regarded, in some cases as an "undesirable foreigner," and though admitted into the United States, he is admitted under humiliating conditions that, because of their exclusive character and lack of consideration, reveal either a sense of vanity on the part of those who impose them, or contempt against those upon whom they are imposed. On this subject measures have been taken that are against international law, for the attempt has been made to prevent the entrance of Latin Americans, and especially Mexicans, into the United States simply because of their nationality. Can there be a better understanding between our two countries when such measures are taken at a time when all is cordiality and Mexico in good faith is making every effort to settle her problems

with the United States? These are the facts that are deeply engraved in the minds of the peoples and, in the course of time, have a tragic repercussion. Instead of contributing to the rapprochement of our peoples, they are likely to be a source of trouble.

Another racial prejudice is that of considering the Latin American as incapable of managing things for himself in his private business, and even incapable of self-government. This latter belief is perhaps the hidden psychological element that has originated many of the acts of the government of the United States, and in general ruled its conduct towards the Latin American countries. Certain it is that the frequent disturbances in the life of the Latin American peoples and their lack of prevision in the matter of finances—all an hereditary product of race and political inexperience—may have given cause to that racial prejudice, but a careful study and adequate consideration of the subject would easily prove that such racial prejudice is the product of defective reasoning or observation and not one of reality. The Latin American and, above all, the Mexican, is intelligent, has quick perception, is easily adaptable to his environment, and not only capable of assimilating new methods, but even of improving upon them. The juridical evolution in social matters that has taken place in Mexico in the last few years, which places her above any European country and even above the United States, is a most conclusive proof that the North American concept to which I have been referring is a racial prejudice not based upon sound reasoning.

Also, we ourselves do not deny that we entertain racial prejudices, and though of a lesser importance than those already mentioned, they are to be strongly condemned. From the mixture of the Indian race with the Spanish in the American countries, especially in our country, we have inherited a distrust of the foreigner, as a result of long years of oppression and slavery; and what is worse, an ill-will, also hereditary, towards the Spaniard, which education and the course of time have almost eradicated. Likewise, the resentment towards the United States engendered by the tragedy of 1847, and by the tragedies of Colombia, Haiti, Nicaragua, which we Latin Americans consider as our own, is rapidly disappearing, but not so the distrust. This distrust, at any rate, is a problem of the future and of a racial character. And it is more difficult to erase because its roots come from historical

facts. It is for the present and the future governments of the United States to combat such prejudices by means of a just and sound international policy in America. }

Another racial prejudice is that of considering as exploiters all foreigners who come and settle in Mexico. The origin of this prejudice is very remote: from the iniquitous exploitation of the Indians by the *encomenderos* during the Colonial period and then from monopoly of all commerce and trade by foreigners. It has also its recent causes, as enormous concessions of lands and water, and of other nature, given by former governments, especially by that of Porfirio Díaz, to foreign companies, which, notwithstanding our legislative efforts to modify them or cancel them, are still in effect. This prejudice is also disappearing and it is no longer held by the educated.

In Mexico there is the popular prejudice engendered by the belief that the United States is desirous of territorial expansion and frequent diplomatic interventions. This prejudice is apparently confirmed by the armed expeditions sent into Mexico by President Wilson in 1914 and 1916 with no justification whatsoever, and without any logical explanation. It will be a long time yet before this prejudice is eradicated from the minds of the Mexicans, a prejudice whose responsibility belongs solely to the man who changed the university toga for the presidential chair of the most powerful country in the world.

It is painful to speak of these affronts, and more so to speak of them before you, the members of the Fifth Seminar. But the subject that has been assigned to me compels me to analyze impartially and unmercifully all of these facts, for through their consequences in the course of time they contribute to the creation of obstacles to a better understanding between the two countries. On the other hand, we are studying the subject in all of its far-reaching importance in a meeting of serene intellectuals, and it would be hypocrisy indeed were we to refrain from speaking of our common errors for fear of being offended, and especially so when the Seminar is looking for a solution to the interesting problems that affect two neighbor countries, and also two races in the same continent. The aim in view is sufficient justification for our investigation, no matter how deep it may go.

I will now pass to another order of facts, which, past or present, have been an abundant source of prejudice and distrust, and have

been creative of obstacles to a better understanding between the Latin American countries and the United States of North America, especially in the relations of the latter with our country.

I will cite the just reclamations of Mexico, some legally recognized by international arbiters, and which the United States Government has never satisfied. Years come and go and Mexico raises her voice in vain for the recognition or satisfaction of justice. The cases of *El Chamizal*, *El Colorado*, and others are proof that Mexico sees no response to her spirit of justice, no reciprocity with an equal spirit on the part of the United States Government. This attitude does not produce rapprochement, it separates; does not produce cordiality, but distrust; does not bring understanding, but controversies which grow more and more difficult as the years pass. And in close relation with this disdainful attitude, there is another side of the policy of the United States towards Latin America, and towards Mexico in particular. I refer to the constant and troublesome claims made by the United States through diplomatic channels in questions of scarcely any international importance, nor even of national importance for the United States, but simply matters that involve individual interests only. The archives of the Department of State are clogged with documents referring to such reclamations, and constitute the bulk of the work of the embassies of both countries. However, this attitude is logical. No government in the world has carried to such an extreme the doctrine of protection for the lives and interests of its citizens as the United States Government. From the general principles of international law, which specifies in what cases it is licit for a nation to adopt certain measures for the protection of the lives and interests of its citizens who reside in another country, the policy has been carried to the extent that such lives and interests are considered invulnerable even in cases of force majeure or which are fortuitous, and in all cases with only personal responsibility for the injured and not for the country in which of his own free and spontaneous will the claimant has chosen to live. Attempts have been made to base claims of this character even in cases where damages are caused by private persons, and not by the Government or its agents.

It is obvious, then, that if we are constantly being harassed by this sort of claims; if because of the refusal to grant a concession; because

of the least illegal act of a government official or agent; or because of any of the daily acts that occur in the lives of the people; a citizen of the United States considers himself injured in his interests or his ambitions; it is obvious, I repeat, why we entertain distrust and even ill-will, and that such policy is seen by us as unjust, instead of one that produces cordiality, and therefore, when we discuss our mutual problems, it is rather difficult to approach them in a fair and practical spirit. It is painful to say this before you, the members of the Fifth Seminar, but we are here to say the truth and not to hide it, otherwise it would not be worth the trouble to have meetings of this kind. Our object is to be acquainted as far as it is possible with the causes that bring disagreement and to do everything in our power to eradicate them.

There is another fountain of discord for the peoples of Latin America, one that reaches even to Europe: the Monroe Doctrine. It is not my purpose to analyze it as to its value in international law, for apart from the many and different interpretations given to it by North American statesmen, it is not the subject of this lecture. I do propose, however, to go briefly into the consequences of the Monroe Doctrine, along with the subjects we are investigating.

For Mexico the Monroe Doctrine is non-existent as an international juridical fountain, and as a so-called source of benefit to Latin America. Mexico will always deny the recognition of such Doctrine and will not even discuss it. Mexico's attitude in this respect is radical. For the publicists of Latin America and for a good many North American impartial writers, the Monroe Doctrine is a childish theory that the governments of the United States have used to dissimulate a tutelage over Latin America in some cases, and in others to cover an imperialistic policy detrimental to international justice. Regardless of whatever explanation or interpretation has been given to the Monroe Doctrine by North American statesmen, even including the benevolent interpretation given by Mr. Hughes, which limits it to guaranteeing the political independence of the American countries and as opposed to the acquisition of territory in this hemisphere by any power not American ("Relations of the United States with the Other Nations of the Western Hemisphere," page 20, published by Princeton University), the Doctrine is nothing but a rule of political conduct of the

United States, never a doctrine of international law. The so-called Monroe Doctrine has been and is an affront to the nations of America, and their peoples see in that line of conduct of the United States a menace of tutelage and intervention in their affairs, and so long as it is invoked by the government of the United States it will be difficult to arrive at an understanding between the United States and all the other American countries, Canada excepted. The latter is not affected by the Doctrine because according to North American principles it cannot be "retroactive," and then, again, Canada is a possession or dominion of a powerful European nation, and is not interested in doctrines which she knows well will not be applied to her. The so-called Monroe Doctrine is, therefore, a powerful factor in the non-rapprochement between the United States and the Latin American countries.

Likewise, when the foreign policy has dictated it or its economic interests have demanded it, the United States has not refrained from acquiring foreign territory or creating zones of influence, though apparently respecting the independence of the affected country. These are, however, facts whose enumeration and investigation would be tedious and out of place in a lecture of this nature. But their consequences have been, necessarily, to increase the distrust of the other countries, and such a state of mind is not favorable to rapprochement. It is necessary, therefore, to eradicate that feeling at all costs.

We, the Latin Americans, are not exempt from blame. Far from it, our perennial discords, our frequent civil strifes, our indolence and our susceptibilities, all characteristic of the race and its environment, contribute to the unfavorable judgment that the North American has formed with regard to our capacity for self-government, and above all, as to our capacity to guarantee the life and the property of the foreigner. But apart from this concept, unfounded because it is born of undue generalizations of isolated acts, or of lamentable civil wars and changes of government through violence, there are no causes, nor can there be any, on the part of the Latin American peoples to prevent an understanding with the United States. Not one of the Latin American countries, not even Mexico, can compare with the United States in its economic and military resources. As it never happened that the weaker nation pretended to pass judgment, impose conditions, or, in a word, offend a stronger nation, it is obvious that on the part

of the Latin American peoples, outside of damage to the lives and interests of North America, there can be no possible action that will prevent a better understanding.

I have made a brief analysis of those cases which are common to Mexico and the other Latin American countries in their relations with the United States. I will now speak of those special problems that have arisen between the North American countries, after which I shall attempt to point out the road which we must follow to bring about an understanding between both countries.

A prominent place is occupied by the hot and, at times, dangerous controversy between the two countries engendered by the Mexican laws in the matter of petroleum. The rights invoked by the American government in favor of its citizens were derived from so-called contracts entered into with the private owners of the lands in days when the owner of the surface was entitled to the exploitation of the subsoil, while the new Constitution reserves this right exclusively to the nation. The objections of the United States were, then, objections against the Mexican Constitution, and it will be difficult, indeed, to find an example where a country has denied to another the right to establish the constitution it sees fit, and Mexico could not see how a principle of international law and of public interest which implied the nationalization of her natural resources, should be the object of a controversy of such troublesome and even dangerous nature as the one that took place. Fortunately, it has passed, and I only mention it as an example of how two countries come to an understanding when the voice of justice is heard. If there is the will, there is no dispute or question between two peoples that cannot be settled amicably exactly as in the case of individuals.

A similar controversy arose out of the application of the agrarian laws enacted with the high purpose of redeeming the Mexican peasants from the state of semi-slavery or feudalism in which they lived in the twentieth century and in a country governed by democratic institutions. I have no information as to the status of this controversy, but we must have faith in its amicable solution if the controversy still exists.

There are other questions which have been discussed and for which solutions have been found in some cases, all of which can be included

in the second group, in which the main idea has been the so-called protection of properties and rights of individuals, as in acquisition of property in forbidden zones, concessions of lands and water rights. These questions confirm the fact that the Mexican government is frequently harassed with diplomatic complaints and reclamations involving purely individual or personal matters, and by no means questions of a national or international nature.

As to the problems arising out of damages caused by the revolution, Mexico has decided, more out of a sense of justice than of an international obligation, to submit them to mixed commissions, which fact alone reveals the good faith and the good will of our country.

Is it possible that there may exist between the two countries opposed economic interests of the nature of those which provoked the World War, proportionate in magnitude to their importance? Off-hand, I do not dare to assert that that is not the case. There are two questions in which the economic views of the two countries are opposed, since happily there is no question of a commercial competition or rivalry because of a desire to acquire foreign markets. One is the question of immigration of Mexicans to the United States, and the other is the tariff question. The first is the more serious because the American sees it from an economic, competitive viewpoint, while to the Mexican it is a question of nationality, and, therefore, intransigent. The second, or the tariff question, of much lesser importance now, is confined to a restriction to our agricultural exports, which are small, indeed, in relation to the consumption and the protective tariffs of our incipient national industries.

Mexican petroleum may yet be in the future, perhaps, a source of trouble principally because of the decadence of the petroleum industry in the United States. But even this question diminishes in importance because of the fact that the exploitation of Mexican petroleum is mainly in the hands of American companies. The question is, however, worthy of study, and I am sorry that time does not permit me to go further into the matter.

Lastly, we have the question of the public debt of Mexico. This cannot and should not constitute an obstacle in the relations of both countries. In the first place, it is a question of loans, not from government to government, which would perhaps justify a direct interven-

tion of the creditor, but of private citizens of several countries to the Mexican Government, and the bankers, members of the Committee, are the representatives of the bondholders. If Mexico is not capable of continuing the interest and amortization payments, that gives no justification for diplomatic action on the part of the country of which the bankers are citizens. And if some day the debt should become a government debt, even then the creditor would have necessarily to respect the resolution adopted by the Second Hague Conference not to resort to armed force in the collection of contracted debts. That resolution or convention has been ratified by the United States. It could not be otherwise.

I have rapidly reviewed the principal aspects of the subject of this lecture. Each point could be entered into more in detail and with a better result, but it would have been impossible for me to do it. There only remains now to make certain suggestions which I believe would produce the results which we all desire.

If the difference in language is an obstacle, let us encourage the study and use of the language of each country in the other as rapidly as possible. The universities should give special attention to this matter, sending special missions, multiplying the short and rapid courses and not the highly cultural. If our geographical vicinity is apt to cause friction, let us conduct ourselves like good neighbors, being mutually helpful and tolerant for each other's defects. If there exist racial and historical prejudices, the educational and cultural work, quiet and incessant, must tend to eradicate them; and the governments on their part must act accordingly, giving proof in their acts that there is no reason for such prejudices remaining once the motive has been removed and the error rectified. If the Monroe Doctrine and the effort to maintain it by the government of the United States is a fountain of discord and a cause for lack of cordiality, then let us abandon it and never mention it again, for not only is it not in accord with the rights of the peoples nor required for the "defense" of the United States, but its "hour" has passed and it is now only a vestige of times gone by and of a thought that is not adaptable to modern civilization. Were it an instrument of "offense," that would be enough to execrate it. International altruism, practical and really effective, should be the rule or guide for all America.

If the constant diplomatic claims in the name of private interests are to be a cause of disagreement and misunderstanding, the thing to do is to abolish that practice and clarify for the future the action of the government so that it will make itself felt only in cases specified or authorized by international law. If legislative or other restrictions to individuals of other races are to be the cause of offense to their respective countries and a motive for disagreement, let us make amends and confess our error. If the so-called protection of lives and properties is to be taken as guaranteed success in business and in life even in cases of force majeure, and this misconstruction menaces our relations, then let us make the adjustments. If the recognition of governments is left to the arbitrariness of international politics instead of to the constitutional requirements of the peoples themselves, and conditions are imposed for the recognition of their governments, there cannot be understanding between the nations, but rather there will result constant friction whose far-reaching effects no one can foresee.

If close commercial contact united the peoples as it unites the individuals, and prosperity makes them good friends, the thing to do would be to encourage economic coöperation, to advocate the suppression of handicaps and obstacles to international commerce, to procure the security of investments, and the suppression of onerous taxes. It is necessary to advocate the abolition of tariff strifes, and to favor reciprocal immigration. And, in short, it is necessary to suppress all unsound policies either of a political or economic nature, and, in general, let the strong respect the weak, encourage mutual help and an amicable coöperation.

Procedures and methods must also be purified. To that end we require the powerful help of the press, an agency which can create enmities just the same as it can make friends. The future holds for our two peoples a great mission of peace and harmony in the name of two great races, and that will be accomplished when Mexico and the United States understand each other and realize their high destinies.

FLORENCE E. ALLEN of the Ohio State Supreme Court, the only woman on a supreme court bench, is an able music critic, a student of international law and a distinguished jurist.

ETHICS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

FLORENCE E. ALLEN

THE DEMAND that ethical principle govern in group relationships is the significant movement of our times. The colossal importance of this movement with reference to international questions lies in the fact that it carries with it the seeds of destruction of the war system. The only substitute for the settlement of international disputes by resort to armed force is their settlement by the rules of equity and justice. Resort to amicable adjustment rather than to armed violence has proved the only feasible method of settling individual controversy, and there is no reason to believe that this substitute for violence will not prove workable in international matters. In fact, wherever tried, whether through the medium of hearing by commission or resort to arbitration, amicable adjustment of international controversy has been achieved.

In our efforts to replace the exercise of the war power by the exercise of ethical principles in foreign relations, we are aided in this hemisphere by the fact that in the United States the power to make war has always been a function not of the executive, but of the legislature. In Mexico also, both the Constitution of 1857 and the Constitution of 1917 provide that Congress shall have power "to declare war upon consideration of the facts or data presented by the President or Executive." It is true that the war power in the United States has sometimes been exercised by the Executive, not under the guise of

formal declaration of war, but under the guise of forcible intervention. Such was undoubtedly the case in Roosevelt's action with reference to Panama. However, in the main the fact that Congress has possessed the power of declaring war has resulted in a respect for exercise of the power on the part of the Executive. When the Executive has overstepped, salutary protests have been entered against the commission of acts of war by the President, upon the theory that since the Congress has the power to declare war, it necessarily has the powers incidental to the war power. Lincoln stated with reference to the Mexican War, which he vigorously opposed:

"Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose, and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect. If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us'; but he will say to you, 'Be silent; I see it, if you don't.'"

As Lincoln viewed it the Constitution gave the war-making powers to Congress, for the following reason:

"Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where kings have always stood."

Lincoln thus pointed out that many a war has been fought, not from conscious grievance on the part of the people at large, but from the greed or whim of kings who possessed in their sovereignty the power of declaring war. He believed that the cause of peace was advanced when the right to declare war was placed in the representatives of the people; and indeed this is a potent reason why the United States has stood in the vanguard of the nations for peaceful

adjustment of international differences. From the beginning at least some Americans have realized that government was meant for men and not men for government. Therefore many of our Presidents have favored a genuine peace policy, and this fact facilitates our task of seeking to enforce ethical principle as the basis of settlement in international disputes. Our first President, Washington, called attention to the fundamental need of ethical principle in international relationships. When we quote his famous speech against entangling alliances we fail too often to think of that portion of the address in which he points out that the truest protection against war is justice and amity in international relationships. Lincoln, Taft, Roosevelt, Cleveland, Wilson and Coolidge all declared outstanding peace doctrines. Lincoln directed his Secretary of State to send the following communication with reference to the question of establishing a protectorate in Mexico:

"For a few years past the condition of Mexico has been so unsettled as to raise the question on both sides of the Atlantic whether the time has not come when some foreign power ought, in the interest of society generally, to intervene—to establish a protectorate or some form of government in that country and guarantee its continuance there. *You will not fail to assure the government of Mexico that the President neither has, nor can ever have, any sympathy with such designs, in whatever quarter they may arise or whatever character they may take on.* The President never for a moment doubts that the republican system is to pass safely through all ordeals and prove a permanent success in our own country, and so be recommended to adoption by all other nations. But he thinks also that the system everywhere has to make its way painfully through difficulties and embarrassments which result from the action of antagonistic elements which are a legacy of former times and very different institutions. The President is hopeful of the ultimate triumph of this system over all obstacles as well as in regard to every other American State; but he feels that those states are nevertheless justly entitled to a greater forbearance and more generous sympathies from the Government and people of the United States than they are likely to receive in any other quarter."

President Taft, in March, 1912, threw the whole weight of his influence against an intervention resolution introduced in the Senate

as a result of the killing of a number of American citizens at the Arizona border. That Mr. Taft's views were not changed by the events occurring at Mexico City in the closing days of his administration, was shown by his utterance at Washington on February 26, when he said:

"We must not in a case like Mexico—for it differs from the Central American Republics—take such action as shall give them to believe that we are moved by selfish purposes, or arouse them to opposition to us. We must avoid in every way that which is called intervention, and use all the patience possible, with the prayer that some power may arise there to bring about peace throughout that troubled country. . . . But I have no sympathy—none at all, and the charge of cowardice does not frighten me—with that which prompts us for purposes of exploitation and gain to invade another country and involve ourselves in a war, the extent of which we could not realize, and the sacrifice of thousands of lives and of millions of treasure."

Up to the administration of Roosevelt, the power to make war was the unqualified right of any nation. During his administration a momentous change took place, for this unqualified and unlimited power became qualified and limited in one important particular. President Roosevelt gave this change his entire approval. He was in full accord with the action of the American delegates at the Second Hague Peace Conference which proposed and secured the enactment of a resolution declaring that the signatory powers should not resort to armed force to collect contract debts due to their nationals from other governments. At about the same time Roosevelt publicly stated:

"It has long been the established policy of the United States not to use its armed forces for the collection of ordinary contract debts due to its citizens by other governments. We have not considered the use of force for such a purpose consistent with that respect for the independent sovereignty of other members of the family of nations, which is the most important principle of international law and the chief protection of weak nations against the oppression of the strong. It seems to us that the practice is injurious in its general effect upon the welfare of weak and disordered states, whose development ought to be encouraged in the

interests of civilization; that it offers frequent temptation to bullying and oppression and to unnecessary and unjustifiable warfare."

It is true that Roosevelt later abandoned this doctrine in his action toward Colombia. The question of the Panama Canal right of way was certainly a property question arising from contract, and if Colombia breached her contract, under the doctrine announced by Roosevelt the recourse should have been not to armed force but to some method of peaceful adjudication for a settlement of the controversy. However, the declaration of the principle with reference to contract debts remained the sole qualification of the war power prior to the World War.

Wilson in many of his public utterances expressed the doctrine that America should resort to armed force only for purposes of actual defense and made the significant statement to the South American nations that "We want no nation's territory, we challenge no nation's honor, we ask for America only what we ask for the other nations of the world."

Under Coolidge was framed and ratified the Multilateral Treaty for the Renunciation of War.

These policies reflect the will of the American people, and also reflect the theory of the United States that the war power, since it belongs to the people, shall be employed not for private economic reasons, but only for actual, legitimate, genuine self-defense.

None of these declarations of policy made by our Presidents embodied law. They were merely executive pronouncements, subject to change either by the same executive or by any incoming successor. However, these expressions, applying as they did the principle that ethics should govern in international difficulties, indicate the trend toward peace policies in the United States during the past years. That trend led us inevitably to the development of such traditional habits of thought and action in world matters as the constant resort to amicable hearing and decision for the settlement of questions of the most difficult type. Typical of such solutions is the work of the mixed commission which decided claims against the United States on behalf of Mexicans and claims against Mexico on behalf of citizens of the United States, under the Conventions of 1868, 1870 and 1878.

In 1862, Secretary Seward, writing to Corwin, the American Minister to Mexico, said: "I find the archives here full of complaints against the Mexican Government for violations of contract and spoliation and cruelties practiced against American citizens."

These complaints thus vividly described by Secretary Seward were included in the 1,017 complaints on the part of citizens of the United States which were examined and adjudicated by a mixed commission, under the convention of 1868 and subsequent conventions which extended the time for the duration of the commission. This settlement covered all claims subsequent to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, February 2, 1848, up to February 1, 1869. The jurisdiction of the commission under the convention of 1868 extended to all claims on the part of corporations, companies and all private citizens against the Government of Mexico for injuries to persons or property, and the convention authorized and instructed the commission to decide these claims to the best of their judgment, according to public law, justice and equity. The two governments agreed that the decisions of the commission should be final. Each country appointed one commissioner and an umpire was also appointed. Dr. Francis Lieber was the first umpire and upon his death in 1872 Sir Edward Thornton succeeded him. The claims were of various natures such as would arise during a period of aggravated civil war, for illegal imprisonment, for seizure of merchandise, for false arrest, for sale of steamers and other property, for robbery, for seizure of stores, for unlawful exaction of duty, for expulsion from real property, for discrimination in tariff, for murder.

In addition to adjudicating claims between citizens of the United States and the Mexican Government, the same commission adjudicated claims between Mexicans and the United States Government. The sums claimed on the part of citizens of the United States against Mexico aggregated \$470,126,613.40; \$4,125,622.20 were allowed. The claims of Mexicans against the United States amounted to \$861,661,891.15; \$150,498.40 were allowed. With reference to the American claims, 831 claims were dismissed or disallowed and only 186 awards were made. Out of 1,017 cases on the American docket, that is to say, of American citizens against Mexico, 20 were decided by Lieber as umpire, 398 were decided by Thornton as umpire, 580 were decided

by the concurrence of the American and the Mexican commissioners. In other words, over one-half of the American claims were decided with the concurrence of both the Mexican and the American representatives.

It is impossible to over-emphasize the importance of this work as an instance of the perfect feasibility of settling vexatious international difficulties by application of the principles of equity and justice. While these cases were not heard by a court, evidence was admitted and the basic rules of law were actually applied in the decision of the controversies without the establishment of any world court, Hague court, or any other machinery. I do not mean to decry the importance of permanent machinery continually functioning for the adjudication of international disputes. The point I make is that the element which is needed more than any other for the uprooting of the war system is the spirit of conciliation and genuine renunciation of the resort to armed conflict. These controversies between citizens of the United States and Mexico were exactly the sort of controversies which are apt to lead to war. Some of them were of aggravated importance, arising out of the killing of peaceable citizens, and yet both members of the commission, including the American representative, concurred in the dismissal of over one-third of the claims. At least one of the American claims thus unanimously rejected was a claim for murder.

Moreover, the trend toward peace policies in the United States has been definitely shown by the constant and consistent use of arbitration. During the recent controversy between the United States and Mexico over the oil leases, influential public opinion certainly criticized the policies of Ambassador Sheffield. This was not only because of the questions immediately involved, but also because Mr. Sheffield departed from our traditional policy when he declared that our difficulty with Mexico could not be arbitrated. Property is not generally considered as important as life. It would seem that if claims concerning the lives of citizens could be settled by hearings before a commission, so could claims concerning money be settled by arbitration. The outcome of events proved Mr. Sheffield to have been wrong, for through Mr. Morrow an amicable settlement has been set in process with Mexico.

There is much cogency in the conception that the peace movement

will only attain its end when the individual has been taught, as the saying is, to think peace—when his outlook has been broadened and he realizes the similarity of desires, motives and needs that exist through all of the human groups. However, the peace movement cannot attain this end unless we understand that the will to peace must be expressed through governmental action. The hostilities, racial and economic, which are the causes of war, always come to conclusion in some act of government which actually sets the war in train. While the causes of war have their roots in deep-seated elements, both in individual and national life, the immediate institution of the war is made by an act of government. Hence the public opinion which demands peace must also demand that ethical standards be expressed in governmental as well as in individual action.

This fact is strikingly illustrated both in the negative and the positive, by our recent history with reference to the enactment of international law through treaty. In 1925 the American Institute of International Law submitted to the governing board of the Pan-American Union, among other important projects, a project which related to conquest. Some of the finest international scholars of this and other countries of our hemisphere, headed by Dr. James Brown Scott, drafted this project, which reads as follows:

"The American Republics . . . animated by the desire of preserving the peace and prosperity of the continent, for which it is indispensable that their mutual relations be based upon principles of justice and upon respect for law, solemnly declare as a fundamental concept of American international law that, without criticising territorial acquisitions effected in the past, and without reference to existing controversies—

"In the future territorial acquisitions obtained by means of war or under the menace of war or in presence of an armed force, to the detriment of any American Republic, shall not be lawful; and that

"Consequently territorial acquisitions effected in the future by these means cannot be invoked as conferring title; and that

"Those obtained in the future by such means shall be considered null in fact and in law."

The importance of this project is shown by the fact that under international law territory may be acquired by cession, by purchase or

by conquest and subjugation. The inconsistency of this fact with ethical principle stands out in high light when we consider that in the individual law the person who takes property by force gets no title to that property. If I steal a watch, I get no title to that watch. If I sell that watch to John Jones for thirty dollars, he gets no title to that watch, because the thief cannot pass title to the watch. No matter what price Jones paid me, the thief, without knowing that I had stolen that watch, the owner, when he finds the watch, can re-take it into his own possession. But the law between nations with reference to the acquisition of territory has been based upon the proposition that the thief gets title to the thing that he steals. The greater part of the earth's surface now belongs to the nations which hold it because of the fact that some government at some time took that land by force and subjugated it.

If this project on conquest had been enacted by members of the Pan-American Union, it would have constituted an enactment of ethical principle into international law. The project treated a vital subject theretofore totally unaffected by ethical considerations from the new standpoint that the rules of equity should prevail in international matters so far as territorial acquisition is concerned. However, when the Pan-American Union met at Havana in 1928, the project was not even submitted. Necessarily the proposition would have had the entire adherence of the Central and South American States. The records do not show why it was pigeonholed, and the significant fact remains that if the United States had demanded the presentation of that project, it would have been written into law.

The reason why the project was not even submitted, apart from the fact that doubtless certain reactionary forces demanded its defeat, was that it had never secured the support of public opinion. It was given little publicity, and the great body of the people did not even know of its existence.

On the other hand, the enactment of the Multilateral Treaty for the Renunciation of War was a positive instance of the irresistible power of public opinion when forcibly mobilized behind the treaty-making body, namely, the Senate. The epoch-making quality of this treaty has not yet been recognized, but historians will say that the first radical and unequivocal limitation of the legality of the war sys-

tem was attained in the Paris Pact. The Peace Pact grew out of the natural trend of the policies of the United States in international relationships—out of the inherent ethical sense of the race, released through the fact that the war power at last was placed in the hands of the people, mobilized in a successful effort by the people to control the acts of government with reference to the war power.

The mind of the race, for the first time in history, met at Paris upon the proposition that the sovereignties must renounce their sovereign right to do wrong. This was a radical application of ethics in international law. The race may at times recede from this conception. But the mind of the race again and again will return to the principle of the renunciation of war, and in so doing will cut deeper and deeper the path of international peace.

XII

A SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION

CARLETON BEALS of Mexico City, writer and lecturer, is the author of "Mexico, An Interpretation," "Brimstone and Chili"; was with General Sandino in Nicaragua; has traveled in Spain, Turkey, Russia and North Africa; is contributing editor to "Mexican Folkways" and other magazines.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE REVOLUTION

CARLETON BEALS

SOME TIME ago when I was passing through the Veracruz customs, I ran into an Irish girl, with a brogue to make the teacups dance. She was having a great argument with the customs official. I found that she was going to Mexico to marry a Mexican boy she had met in her office in New York. She also had friends in Mexico who had a large family of children and, as there is a high duty on shoes, she was bringing in quite a lot of children's shoes of all sizes. The customs official had ferreted out these children's shoes. They were standing in a row on the top of her trunk. The official and the girl were glaring at each other. She was shouting at him in good Irish brogue, and he was replying in good Mexican Spanish. Neither one understood the other. It looked like one of those diplomatic impasses impossible to patch up. She declared she would not pay one cent of duty. He was equally emphatic she should. I stepped into the breach as interpreter. The customs official said, "She tells me that this lot of shoes, little ones, medium-sized ones, big ones, all belong to her. The lady's papers say she is not married. Therefore, they are not her shoes; she must pay duty." I offered him a cigar, and a bright idea occurred to me. "But, señor," I protested, "you should know that the young lady is going to be married in Mexico." The customs official looked at me, at her, at the shoes. Then he ripped up the bill of charges he had made out, saying, "Ustedes los americanos están muy practicos" ("You Americans are very practical").

Most of us, when we look at a foreign people, put them in a very set category. We like to think of Mexicans as inefficient, dishonest warlike, disorderly. They think of us as "very practical," materialist without any higher sentiments than chasing the almighty dollar. It is all too easy to fall into such easy generalizations about a foreign people.

But this morning I feel that I am dealing with a select group of Americans, which has come here to get a deeper, a more fundamental notion of affairs. You are not, for instance, like a certain Iowa farmer whom I met in Genoa. He was running around with a tape measure in his hand, measuring the width of the streets and writing them down in a little notebook. Each day he was happy when he found a street narrower than any he had found before. Or, again, you are not like the checked-suit salesman of automobile tires whom I met in Madrid. He had become interested in the enormous Spanish medieval door keys, and he spent every free moment buying these old door keys, until he had half a trunk of junk iron. He thought these keys very funny; he was going to tie them with ribbons and present them to his friends in the Rotary Club back home.

You people, I am sure, do not fall into that category, although I sadly suspect that some of you may have fallen to the ignominious level of purchasing tourist feather cards; but, on the whole, I feel I am talking to an intelligent and select group. Therefore, it is my duty to speak clearly about certain things here in Mexico; and, in spite of my facetious beginning, this is a serious talk.

There is little possibility of getting at a foreign people unless you are willing to hear the unpleasant things as well as the pleasant. You people have been bathing in the crystalline waters of good will; you are all imbued with a fine feeling of emotional uplift regarding Mexico. You wish to carry the glad tidings back across the Rio Grande. I quite agree with this, and far be it from me to soil these crystalline waters by anything I might say. But good will should be something more than an abstract sentiment. It should be something removed from career-making, for instance. If it is worth anything at all, it should be based upon real understanding, and real understanding is not a delicate sentiment like house slippers you put on in the evening. It has to be super-critical in order to see every aspect of the situation.

So I am going to counterbalance somewhat the over-favorable reports you have already garnered and give you a little of the other side as well.

You have come to Mexico in a serious moment. You come to Mexico at a moment when the industrial situation is in the depths; when oil production is still at a low ebb; when mining is in terrible straits; when agriculture is barely holding its own. You come at a moment when the Mexican Revolution has culminated in the dislocation from the *hacienda* of seven million people. This dislocation has not as yet resulted in the providing of these people with the proper means of gaining a decent livelihood. You have come at a moment of open reaction in governmental affairs in which little of the so-called Revolution remains.

Let us see, before we go on, just what a revolution is. Personally I have been in six so-called upheavals in various parts of the world. I have looked upon men's mangled bodies. I have seen dead bodies hanging from trees and telegraph poles the length and breadth of Mexico. I have been in trains attacked by rebels. I have been held up on the public highways. I have been seized by a general and threatened with various dire penalties. So I can speak rather intimately of some of the atrocities that go with revolutions. Revolutions are not pleasant affairs. Keep that clearly in mind.

But I am not concerned so much with this gruesome physical aspect of revolutions as I am with the more idealistic purposes which they are supposed to carry into effect. And here again, you find that there is no such thing as human perfection in revolutions: perhaps a good deal less than in more normal times of life. You find that the ideals of revolution are often the ideals of war; that the personal greed and ambitions of strutting, inordinately selfish generals are also part of revolutions. Over and beyond that is also the irking spiritual coercion of minds and bodies to a new way of life.

The Mexican Revolution has had ideals. It has had, too, personal ambition, greed, treachery and intrigue. It is not a thing of one color.

I would remind you also that revolutions have a definite cycle. Most of them have been fathered by philosophical theories. The French Revolution was sired by Voltaire, Rousseau and the Encyclopedists. The Russian Revolution was hatched from the eggs of Lenin,

Marx and Engels. The Fascist, by Corrodini and the Italian pragmatists. The Mexican Revolution came into the world without a father. The French Revolution proceeded through a semi-constitutional stage by various steps to the Jacobins, then to an even more radical outlook. But within five short years reaction had set in. By the end of twelve years the First Consul could say, "The Revolution is back where it began. It is ended." The Russian Revolution also passed through various stages: from the semi-constitutional régime of Kerensky, through the social revolution to the Bolsheviks. The reaction came in Russia five years after the first outbreak, with the Nep policy of Lenin; then swept on to a true agrarian revolution.

In Mexico, before the Revolution went on to its more radical phase, it passed from the semi-constitutional stage of Madero to the brutal reaction of Huerta. Thus temporarily submerged, it gathered new force in a more radical manifestation under Carranza, Obregón and Calles. The cycle is now complete. The Revolution culminated in the year 1926, i. e., in the middle of Calles' term, when the First Consul of Mexico at that time might have said, "The Revolution is going back to its beginning. It is almost over."

These are definite cycles that should not astonish us. They spring from certain forces of human life and society. Today we see that the Mexican Revolution has in a sense gone back to its beginning.

First of all, in dealing with this balance sheet of the Revolution, I am going to treat the agrarian problem of Mexico. I do so because I consider it the most fundamental problem in Mexico, for after all more than 70% of the Mexican population live in the rural districts. This is a rural country; and its happiness and future must, for the time being, depend upon the soundness of its agrarian life. I would speak to you of the relation of the population of Mexico to the agrarian life of Mexico. I wish to read two statements to you. One was made by former President Obregón in the year 1923: "The restitution of *ejidos* is already a constitutional right which will be carried out with as little injury as possible. . . . With regard to the reduction of agricultural production for the present year, I do not believe that this diminution is due to the restitution of *ejidos*, but to the lack of confidence of the *hacendados*, resulting in part from the fact that our Revolution has placed them in the necessity of having to pay

more reasonable wages. The great majority have not accepted the Revolution and still use very primitive means of cultivation. Many prefer to cease sowing crops rather than to pay proper wages. I am certain that the agriculturists to whom I refer are determined not to progress, not to import the modern machinery necessary to compete with other centers of civilization, and their properties must pass into the hands of those who are more apt, in order that these can cause the land to produce what the *hacendados* are incapable of producing."

In an interview in San Luís Potosí, June 15, 1930, seven years later, Calles made the following statement which he has not retracted: "If we wish to be sincere with ourselves we must confess to the sons of the Revolution that agrarianism, as we have understood and practiced it thus far, has been a failure. If the *ejido* has been a failure it is useless to extend the system. If the *ejido* triumphed, then if more land were needed the people should have the money to pay for it. A man should have as much land as he is capable of putting under cultivation."

This is a wide difference of opinion in a period of seven years. It is pertinent to us, if the President of Mexico, who more than any other man tried to put into effect the *ejido* or communal system, now, but two years out of office, declares it a failure. It means that the seven million people dislocated from the *hacienda* are in worse immediate straits than they were before the Revolution. This is a serious situation, and we should with all frankness examine the question whether the communal system in Mexico has failed.

Before we do that I should like, in order to give a more rounded picture, to take you back to the time of Díaz. When we look back upon that period, in many ways we are not permitted to be too critical. In the time of Díaz there were nine and a half million people on the *haciendas* of Mexico in a condition of utter serfdom. They worked for ten or fifteen cents a day; they were bound to the soil by debt slavery passed on from father to son. They could not leave the *hacienda*. They rarely received money, but in its stead received checks or *fichas* to be exchanged at the *hacienda* store. Their lives completely lacked that freedom of movement which characterizes modern society. In Yucatan they worked in slave camps, sometimes with chains on

their legs. It was, in short, a condition in which over 90% of the rural population of Mexico was landless and enslaved.

President Wilson once pointed out that in Morelos practically the entire state was in the hands of some twenty odd families. Naturally with the outbreak of the Revolution there was a violent upsurging, a violent reaction on the part of the peasants.

Just the other day I was told a story of an *hacienda* in the state of Oaxaca owned by a Spaniard. Working on the *hacienda* were some Yaqui Indians taken in a revolt and sent to him as slaves. After each day's work they were locked up in a narrow room, too small for them even to lie down properly; some had to lie across each other. When the Revolution broke out these Yaquis seized their proprietor and nailed him to his own door. Things of that sort have occurred in Mexico. That is the gruesome side of revolutions.

I might tell you another little incident which dates back to the year 1923, when I was invited by an American proprietor, who previously had boasted that a peon was flogged to death every week on his estate, to go down to visit his *hacienda*, where he had been unable to go for six years. His son at that time was in charge. We went through Veracruz, through the Isthmus to the state of Chiapas. My host invited me to go with him out into the fields. In preparation for the trip he strapped a gun to his belt and coiled up a blacksnake whip in his hip pocket. His son protested, "Father, you had better not take that whip along with you. We do not do things that way any more." But his father did not heed him.

Presently we came upon a peon, working on an irrigation ditch. He looked up and nodded brightly. Then I saw something happen to my companion. His neck muscles stiffened, the blood vessels stood out. In a menacing voice he said, "You dirty dog, why don't you stand up when a white man talks to you and take off your hat?" The peon stood up, folded his arms and said, "Chief, go ahead and use your whip"—for my companion had drawn out his whip—"but by nightfall you will be in jail or you will be a dead man." Before the Revolution no peon would have dared to talk to his peers in that fashion.

I give you these few intimate pictures to show the change that has transpired in Mexico during the past twenty years, a change in the relationships and psychology of the classes. There has been an

overwhelming change along those lines, a new criterion of human freedom has been created in Mexico. In spite of this, sentiment should not permit us to blind ourselves to elemental economic facts. I should say that Calles is right: that up to the present time, from the point of view of economic efficiency, the communal system has failed. First, there have been about seven million people thrust off the *hacienda* into the free village. About four million of these have received lands in some form or another, most of them according to the communal system. But those lands have not been sufficient in acreage and they have been of such poor quality that they have not provided the free villages with proper support. In other words, the population has been dislodged and put into a situation where only with great difficulty can they gain a livelihood.

Take a certain village in the state of Oaxaca—that of Valerio Trujano. It was not made a free village until 1926. In that year it was then cut off from the *hacienda* and given lands. A village of about five hundred inhabitants and it received less than two hundred acres. Most of this is stony hill lands never before cultivated in the annals of mankind. Obviously, this is not sufficient or proper acreage for the free village to support itself. What is the result? The *hacienda* which dated back to the old *encomiendas* when it comprised eighty square miles, has boycotted the free village, has cut off the electric lights, etc. Though the villagers cannot earn a decent living from their own lands, they are boycotted by the *hacienda*, which refuses to employ them. In addition, there is constant political bickering. The *hacendado* sends representatives to Oaxaca and Mexico City and lobbies against the free village. For three years he managed to impose a mayor on the village, recognized by the central authorities.

As a result, all the few funds the village could get together were stolen. The *hacienda* mayor was four hundred pesos short when he left office and in disgrace and fearing reprisals threw himself under a train. The free villagers captured their village. But the strife between the free village and the *hacienda* continues, and what little money the villages can scrape together must be used to send lobbyists to the state capital or to Mexico City. The villagers are fighting a losing battle.

In spite of extensive land distribution in Mexico, the *hacienda* still

remains the dominant factor both from the standpoint of acreage and number of properties. Probably one-fourth of the rural property of Mexico, according to the most reliable statistics, is in acreage of less than one hectare, which bears out the point which I have made that the peasants have been put into a position in which they cannot support themselves. Sixty per cent of the land in Mexico privately held still is in the large *haciendas*.

In the second place, the government, either because of inability or lack of knowledge or sincerity, has been unable to provide these seven million dislocated peasants with the tools, the knowledge, the means to cultivate their meager properties in the right manner. It is a tragic thing to see in many places the inability of the peasants to make their lands produce properly.

In the third place, the closed-in economy of the production of corn and beans for local and personal use runs counter to the national needs of Mexico, runs counter to the twentieth-century forms of human society. The Indian has solved his problem temporarily though inadequately; but by and large the *ejido* does not represent as yet a sound economy. The Revolution has never faced this fact, has never faced the fact that neither the Mexican village nor the Mexican nation can isolate itself from the modern world economy. The true welfare of Mexico lies in the production of products which have least competition in the world's markets, products more typically Mexican, such products as sugar cane, coffee, tobacco, henequen, bananas, and other tropical fruits. How are these going to be produced? They require competent technical and scientific knowledge. The Revolution has not succeeded in building up any coöperative system for raising these products, nor has it permitted private capital to return to work. Today the nation is facing an agricultural crisis.

Another factor which has made for the failure of the *ejido* system is the fact that the very men who attempted to put it into force are today among the wealthiest landowners in Mexico. Hence it is no longer to the interest of Calles, Sáenz, Portes Gil, et al., to see the peasant movement, which they helped institute and subsequently utilized for their own benefit, to carry itself on to a successful conclusion. The Revolution must either go on to its end or cease being a revolution. I believe that it has ceased being a revolution.

Already it is going back to its beginning and coming to an end. The military praetorian-guard tradition will reassert itself soon. Force will replace progress and the recent liberalizing ideals. In general, the agricultural problem in Mexico has not been treated as an agricultural problem, but as a military problem because, in view of the great land hunger of the armed peasants, there was only one means of satisfying that hunger and that was to give them lands and that quickly. Thus the army of the Revolution was demobilized and the armed peasants more or less removed from the theater of national strife. That is why Obregón managed to bring about prompt stability in Mexico. Secondly, land distribution has too frequently been used as a political instrument, as a vote-getting machine. It still is.

Some years ago in a certain village in Jalisco, we found that the recipients of land were the storekeepers and local politicians. In another village, in Oaxaca, they said, "We have *ejidos*, but we do not bother with that question. They belong to the three richest men in the village." That is robbing Peter to pay Paul. In some places I have seen *ejidos* well cultivated, with happy people on them, but those cases are the exception, not the rule.

Of course, whatever a man's immediate, material condition may be, it is something to be able to call oneself a free man. Mexico can never go back to the old system: it must go on to something else. The seven million dislocated people, though they may not have proper means of support, at least have a better leverage than they had before.

Freedom is sometimes freedom to starve. That is the history of the Industrial Revolution in England, and perhaps the history here. Unless the Revolution goes on to a more constructive aspect, other forces will set in. I would say that those forces began to set in about the middle of President Calles' term. President Calles, on giving up office after the assassination of Obregón, made his famous declaration in Congress that Mexico had now become a country of laws and institutions, and was no longer the plaything of military chiefs. He spoke about democracy and political parties and the freedom of their function. He said that the Revolution was now strong enough so that it could permit the honest entry of every element of national society into Congress, even Catholics, because to show such tolerance would demonstrate the strength of the Revolution. On this occasion

Calles did not speak of the economic and social problems of his country. Calles spoke about political problems. "The Revolution" wished to forget about its more fundamental difficulties.

The First Consul could have said once more, "The Revolution has gone back to its beginning. It has gone back to the ideals of Madero."

But during the Presidency of Portes Gil, we discover that, in a political sense, the Revolution has gone back even further than in an economic sense. The first act of the new National Revolutionary Party was to carry out Calles' ideas of democratic liberality by creating a body 100% of which were members of the National Revolutionary Party! No minority representation. No representation of conflicting interests. None of the concepts of democracy that Calles had stated in his address to Congress. In view of the disastrous economic situation in which Mexico now finds herself, a political machine has been built up called the National Revolutionary Party, a party which is neither national nor revolutionary nor a party. It is a government bureau of political control, supported by seven days' pay a year exacted from government employees, and it viciously suppresses every opposition.

This reaction began under President Calles in 1926. It began first of all in the persecution of the Catholics. I have stood unflinchingly on the side of the government in their theoretical position regarding the Catholic Church, but I was almost deported from Mexico because I dared to speak of the personal abuse of Catholics in that struggle. Every personal right of every Catholic was violated. They were held by the police, they had no legal protection, no protection whatever from the courts of Mexico. Often, a Catholic was arrested and fined; and if he could not pay his fine he was sent out to *Islas Tres Marias*, the Pacific Coast penal colony. It was a glorious moment for arbitrary robbing of Catholics in Mexico. They were jailed and mulcted of their properties without due process of law. If you can take away the personal liberty of a Catholic, you can take away the personal liberty of everybody else. We find that the National Revolutionary Party has now become a machine to keep in office grafting favorites of the régime. Every independent popular organization has been crushed in Mexico. Naturally, these abuses do not get into the papers. Some of us long hoped that out of the maelstrom would come a recognition

of the rights of Mexicans to organize themselves into functioning groups, social, economic and political groups, having full freedom to express themselves.

In Russia an arbitrary dictatorship pursues an economic program. The Mexican Revolution has never had a defined economic program; it has never quite decided whether it wanted to become a democracy or a dictatorship. Now it has become a reactionary dictatorship at a moment when it is trying to forget its economic program. The régime in Mexico, having turned its back on both the economic and social tendencies of Carranza and Obregón, and also upon the political tendencies of Madero, can only sustain itself by a brutal political machine which, in turn, can only be sustained by brutal armed force. The Revolution in Mexico is over.

The army up to now has been the central pivot in Mexican affairs. There has never been an election in Mexico not ratified either before or after by armed conflict. Some of us hoped that out of all this struggle for the first time there would come some system of popular organization control, that the various groups which are springing up in Mexico would come to have sufficient vitality to maintain themselves. It was the first time that such expression was really ever permitted in Mexico. While Mexico at no time during the Revolution has been anything resembling a democracy, nevertheless it has heretofore been the militarists who have shot each other, and as their business in life is to kill and get killed, one does not shed so many tears over their demise. During the Catholic trouble, personal civil liberties began to go by the board. With the death of Obregón a drive was made against the head of the CROM. The organization was partially disrupted by police coercion. Unions were compelled to secede from the CROM. This same coercion proceeded with other organizations. Came the elections, and this coercion proceeded against Vasconcelos; proceeded not only against the right wing, but also against the left wing. The new organization replacing the CROM was attacked in a similar manner and driven out of existence. Its general secretary, David Siquieros, who was to have spoken to you, is today in jail. The week before you came down, nineteen strikers were shipped off to Tres Marias without trial. The jails of Mexico are full of political and labor prisoners, denied all legal protection.

This is an unfortunate political situation. Every one not within the fold of the National Revolutionary Party has been viciously persecuted. The attempted assassination of Rubio was used as a means of further terrorization in Mexico. People were dragged from their beds in all parts of Mexico and taken to the military barracks. Over twenty political prisoners disappeared, shot without trial, at the time when General Eulogio Ortiz, an irresponsible drunk and drug fiend, had the capital under his unchecked control. I do not wish to exaggerate. I do not know whether this is a passing phase or a more permanent phase of development in Mexico. I merely desire to point out to you some of the things which you probably have not heard and which you should know. In doing this I am motivated by only one purpose, and that is that you should go back knowing all sides of the question; motivated further by the fact that I am particularly fond of Mexico. If there is any country which I might call my second fatherland, it is Mexico, and it is precisely because of this that I speak clearly. The Revolution has not only gone back to its beginning: politically it has reverted to tactics even more reprehensible than those of Porfirio Díaz. In the economic sense it has been aborted. It remains to see where Mexico will go. Dislocating seven million people and thrusting them into a new mode of living—this cannot go back. A new set of relationships has been created. But aside from a new status of freedom for the peasant, his economic situation, if anything, is worse than before.

In speaking of the balance sheet of the Revolution there is one bright aspect. The idea of popular education has for the first time really and irrevocably been instituted in Mexico. It never can be abandoned. Whatever régime takes charge, popular education must continue. This is a great hope. Although I have spoken harshly of certain people of the present government, there are others who demand most sincere praise and support. One of these gentlemen is Mr. Moisés Sáenz, who is speaking to you this morning, who has labored indefatigably in carrying on educational work in Mexico. I might go on to point out a number of other things which have been of constructive benefit during these troublous times, but I wish to leave these few suggestions with you rather than to attempt to tell you more than it is possible to tell in one hour.

Permit me to close by telling you one little story. It is a legend

coming out of the town of Amecameca, which nestles at the foot of the two volcanoes. Amecameca means a town upon a town, for in various ages past it is said that the volcanoes sent a flood of lava upon the place and blotted it from sight. Whenever the people grow unworthy and sinful the smoking mountains will stir and send floods of lava upon the town, destroying it anew. This is linked with the Nahua legend of the time cycle of the periodic destruction and renewal of human life upon this planet. Some day, goes the legend, the people of Amecameca will again grow sinful and unworthy and the volcanoes will belch forth and sweep them from sight. After that, the god of rain, Taloc, will come strewing bronze violets, and the goddess of flowers, Xochuquetzl, will strew white lilies. From the violets will come a new race of men with bronze loins and a new race of women with breasts like the sun. When this perfect race has been created, the great god of the mountains will wake his sleeping consort and they will go away.

I have told you this story about human perfection although I have no faith in human perfection. But I think it wise for the human race to keep in its heart forever the ideal of human perfection. The thing called human liberty, everything which makes life worth while, must always be struggled for. Mexico has struggled for such things, has had a vague hope of perfection, and that hope cannot be lost or a nation is lost.

If Mexico needs anything it needs more honesty in its administration; it needs more faithfulness and sincerity and courage in carrying out its problems. Things have come to a new impasse. The Mexican people are again facing the betrayal by the present régime.

You have all come here in a spirit of good will, and I am glad that you have come with that spirit. Far be it from me to be the one to sully those crystalline waters, but I would remind you that we have a Mexican problem today, just as Mexico will always have an American problem. This thing called good will must be based upon true knowledge of facts; it must not be a gourd vine shooting up and withering overnight; it must, like every precious thing in life, be carefully tended and watered and cared for. It should be removed from career-making, from the vicissitudes of American politics, so that once and for all we might evolve in the United States a consistent Mexican

policy and not be ruled by the slogans of our own popular elections or personal interests. We should acquire a technique in the handling of these things. I would leave this message with you—that you go back, remembering not merely the things I have said, which must go into your general picture of the knowledge of Mexico, but also the picture of all things beautiful and fine that you have found here. For me Mexico has been a second fatherland, a place that I have come to love as complementing my own country. We are powerful; Mexico is weak. We are wealthy; Mexico is poor. We are efficient; Mexico is often inefficient. We go in for neatness; Mexico goes in for beauty. I feel that Mexico has something to offer the human spirit and the world, and it is for that reason that I have been a friend of Mexico always and shall continue being so whatever my personal fate as the result of saying some things very clearly.

The human spirit is not an apple to be cut in two, but I think sometimes that the human spirit is maimed and inadequate and we need all sorts of expressions of human life and not merely that dominated by 100% Americanism. I feel that this country complements something in my own country, that it should be permitted to live and grow and develop, and though I have said harsh things—and I do not wish to weaken them with final reservations—I must remind you my words are motivated by the sincerest desire to throw before you a real picture of the real Mexico and not one which favors any particular clique which may for the moment be in power.

HUBERT C. HERRING, executive director of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America, is the founder of this experiment in international relations, the Seminar in Mexico.

THE FINE ART OF UNDERSTANDING

HUBERT C. HERRING

THE SEMINAR in Mexico is an unpretentious venture in the field of human understanding. We are organized around no formula, political, social, economic. Our membership is not united upon any question. At home some of us vote the Republican ticket, others the Democratic and others the Socialist; we worship in the Methodist church and the Catholic cathedral and the Jewish temple; some of us approve the new tariff and others roundly condemn it; some of us would declare that the United States is imperialistic and others would swear that the United States is utterly divorced from all ambition to extend its territory and power; some would vote enthusiastically for prohibition and others would vote energetically against prohibition.

We are committed to no propaganda, no cause, no ambition. We are here as students, fascinated with the beauty of a land which is little known to most of us, caught by the mystery and the loveliness of Mexico, seeking to learn something of the forces which are moving in Mexican life.

I say that we have no cause. My statement may be challenged, and rightly. We are united, I take it, in believing that it is a grievous thing for peoples to live side by side in mutual misunderstanding and suspicion; that it is a better thing for peoples to understand each other; to increase in appreciation of each other's spiritual gifts; to profit by the sharing of cultures, ideas and experiences. In this conviction we are united.

The Fifth Seminar in Mexico is an instrument for the furthering of such understanding. On the one hand, there is our membership of almost two hundred men and women, widely representative of the life of the United States—physicians, lawyers, college professors, teachers, clergymen, Catholic and Protestant, social workers, librarians and business men. Each member of this group has an audience in the United States. The editor may reach a hundred thousand, the writer may reach a million, the clergyman may reach thousands, the college president other thousands, the business man will reach his business associates, the social worker his own community, the president of a woman's club her own group and other groups. These men and women come from San Diego and Boston, from Chicago and New Orleans, from New York and Portland; Maine and Oregon, Philadelphia and Minneapolis, Washington and Butte.

On the other hand, there is the group of Mexican leaders who meet with us, speaking to us, discussing with us. They, too, represent many points of view. They are radicals and conservatives, with the government and against the government. They are lawyers, politicians, artists, writers, educators, social workers, labor leaders, agrarian leaders, economists. They tell us the story as they see it. They do not agree. They are not overanxious to say the thing which they think we wish to hear. We do not come to have our prejudices confirmed. We come to learn the facts about Mexico, to enter into the spirit of Mexico, and to make Mexico our own so far as the Anglo-Saxon can enter into the spirit and spiritual genius of the Latin and the Indian.

During this seminar we have the opportunity of hearing from the lips of the leaders of Mexican life the things which are nearest and dearest to their hearts. We learn of the sweep of a mighty revolution, of the ancient land hunger which has led men to fight against resolute tyrannies, with defeat after defeat, with new tyrannies taking the place of more ancient tyrannies, with betrayals and deceits, with victories and high hopes. We learn of the suspicion which Mexico has learned to hold against the nations of the world, and especially against the United States of America. We visit the studios of Mexican artists. We see the work of the men who have told the story of Mexico with their broad brushes. We hear and see and feel their tale of the eternal struggle for justice and fair dealing and peace. We meet the educators

of Mexico and visit their schools. We catch from them the vision of a people emancipated through knowledge, vitalized through vision, empowered through education. We go into the villages and see the teachers who are the new generals of the revolution. We find those teachers showing men how to read and farm and protect the health of communities. We find lethargy and fervor, victory and defeat.

We work together through this program for three weeks. Some of us will linger for visits to other sections of the country. We shall then return to the United States. We shall tell our story as we have learned it. We shall speak to great audiences and to small. We shall carry the story to college classrooms, to Catholic churches, Protestant churches, Jewish temples. We shall tell our friends about Mexico by our fire-sides from Maine to California. Not all that we report will be fair, not all will be accurate, not all will be discriminating. We shall, perhaps, paint a picture of a people which never was on sea or land. We shall, perhaps, not achieve a sense of proportion, nor shade our story with the proper lights.

Because of the difficulty of entering into the life of another people; because of the difficulty of telling our story with discrimination and accuracy, I am addressing these words primarily to the members of the Seminar. I wish in all candor to tell you of the experience of other years, that you may profit by the mistakes which others have made.

The experience of the past five years indicates that there are two types of people whose peculiar enthusiasms effectually close the door against any adequate comprehension and sympathetic knowledge of this other people.

First, there are those who come to Mexico prepared to prove the validity of their particular faith. It may be a political faith; it may be a social faith; it may be a religious or an economic faith. In one case it may be a Protestant minister; in another it may be a Catholic priest; it may be a Jewish rabbi. It may be one whose controlling motive is the hatred of American imperialism. But no matter what the faith may be, there is a danger that the man of stern convictions will lose much of the wealth and wonder of Mexico in his zeal to prove the validity of those convictions.

Secondly, there are those who come to preach their own peculiar reform. It may be in the field of morals or of religion or of economics.

They approach Mexico in the rôle of the teacher, and it is a dangerous thing to presume to teach another people. They may be right in their teaching. They may have all of the facts upon their side. But the very insistence upon their mission prevents them from entering into the spirit of a people of alien speech and culture.

This is no theoretical point. I have seen believers in prohibition whose enthusiasm was so all-engulfing that no matter where they went, no matter whom they met, they were forever searching out fresh areas in which to extend their teaching. As a result, Mexico became a closed book to them. Its beauty passed them by. The wonder of the artistic genius of the people left no impression. They returned to the United States convinced of their own thesis, but they had learned little of Mexico.

The zeal for the doing of good is highly rated in Christian and Jewish circles, but I suggest that the further we get away from the desire to do good, and the more we cherish the desire to win good, the greater will be our experience.

I urge you, therefore, to divest yourself of the assumption that we are upon a pilgrimage to an inferior people. I can hear your response. I can hear you say that such an idea is far from your minds. But I would ask you in all candor to keep a constant check upon the attitudes which you may unconsciously assume.

I invite you to yield yourself to the spirit of this country and of its people. I invite you to a voyage of discovery. There is wealth here upon which no *conquistador* could lay his hands. You will find this wealth as you view the paintings of Diego Rivera in the Ministry of Education. You will find this wealth as you look at the paintings of Orozco upon the walls of the building in which we are meeting. You will find this wealth in the beauty of the villages which you will visit. You will find this wealth in the mystery and poetry of Guadalupe and of the churches. You will forget to make comparisons and to say to yourself, "In the United States we do things after another fashion." You will forget to sit in judgment. You will forget the smug complacency which is so peculiarly an Anglo-Saxon trait. You will take life as it is—clean, dirty; sanitary and unsanitary; rich, poor; ignorant and learned. You will feel the pageantry of the centuries. You will see the Indian in terms of hundreds of years of oppression and struggle.

I would urge you, too, to break away from the other members of the Seminar whenever you can. We have not arranged to take you to Guadalupe in a group of one hundred fifty, with sputtering motorcycles as an accompaniment, on the theory that that is the best way or the finest way to see Guadalupe. We have simply introduced you to Guadalupe. If you will go yourself in the early morning hours, sit or stand idly in the plaza before the church, move slowly through the church, watch the people at prayer, watch them as they yield themselves to the atmosphere of that great shrine, you will be entering into the life of Mexico.

You will then wander up the hill of Tepeyac and you will feel the drama in which the humble Indian, Juan Diego, took his part four hundred years ago. You will no longer doubt, but you will believe in the miraculous roses. You will believe that religion belongs to the Indian and that the Mother of God was an Indian maiden and that the humblest Indian has as much of a place in the universe as the proudest Spaniard. That is what Guadalupe means.

You will wander in the markets, not in parties of a score, but by ones and twos. You will mark the infinite pains with which the Indian artisan has done his work. You will learn by watching the smallness of his business transactions upon how scant a margin the Indian lives.

You will visit the schools. You will see men and women who are making the Mexico which is to be. You will see rude buildings, but you will feel great spirits.

I ask you, then, to shake free from your own enthusiasms, from your own special reforms, from your own convictions as to what a people and a nation should be. Yield yourself to Mexico and Mexico will yield herself to you. To the degree in which you succeed in doing this, you will equip yourself to return to the United States as an interpreter of people to people, as an agent for the hastening of that interchange of spirit and culture in which none are impoverished, but in which all are enriched.

INDEX

- Actopan, 28-29; 122-23
 Agrarianism, 19, 154-57, 177-81, 316-21
 Alba, Pedro de, 124-27
 Alcoholism, 141-43, 197-208
 Allen, Florence E., 301-10
 Almaraz, José, 208-17
 Alvarez, Alexander, 268-69
 Amecameca, 325
 Army, 323
 Atl, Dr., 67-68, 227
 Austin, Mary, 71-82
- Báez, Victoriano D., 146-53
 Batten, James Hoffman, 241-43
 Beals, Carleton, 313-26
 Beteta, Ramón, 33-45
 Brito Rosado, Efraín, 127-30
- Calles, Plutarco Elias, 115; 315-22
 Canadian border, 229-31
 Casanova, Pablo Gonzáles, see Gonzáles, Pablo Casanova
 Conquest, territorial acquisition by, 308-9
 Chávez, Carlos, 104-107
 Clark, J. Reuben, 285-6
 Clergy, 89-90
 Communists, 189
 Crime and criminals, 208-09
 CROM, 186-90, 323
 Cuba, 270
 Cultural missions, 116-18
- Death, day of, 13, 53, 78
 Debt, public, 157-59, 298-99
- Education, 28-29, 39-42; rural schools, 112-15; Indian schools, 115-16; primary, 116; teacher training, 116-18; secondary, 118; cultural missions, 116-18, 122-23; National University, 124-27; Roman Catholic, 136-38; Protestant, 148-50
Ejido, 317-20
 Espinosa de los Monteros, Antonio, 154-59
 Esteva Ruiz, Roberto A., 265-72
- Federal system, 255-62
 Foreigners, attitude toward, 167, 291-93
- Gamio, Manuel, 234-5, 243, 247, 248-51
 Gonzáles Casanova, Pablo, 47-58
 Gaudalupe, Virgin of, 90, 331
 Guatemala, 95-103
- Harnoncourt, Count René d', 83-88
 Harris bill, 244, 247, 250
 Herring, Hubert C., 327-31
 Humbolt, Alexander, 180-81
- Immigration, 225, 232-35; into Texas, 235-40; into California, 241-43; control through consular service, 244-45
 Indian, attitude towards life, 35, 46-47; education, 28-29, 39-42, 112-23; land, 19, 178-82; superstitions, 50-53
 Industries, 168-73
 Inman, Samuel Guy, 283-88
 International Joint Commission, 230-2
 International law, 301-10
- Jones, Chester Lloyd, 161-174, 277-82
 Jordan, David Starr, 226-28
 Juárez, Benito, 18, 125
 Jury, 216
- Kellogg, Paul U., 221-35
- Labor, 138-41; unrest, 160; trade unions,

- 185-87; CROM, 187-90; in the United States, 190-94; reaction, 323
 Legends, 58-68
 Lincoln, Abraham, 302-3
 Locarno, 223
- Merida, Carlos, 95-103
Mestizo, 11, 21-22
 Miranda, Miguel Darío, 133-145
 Moctezuma, 14
 Monroe Doctrine, 265-88, 295-96
 Monteros, see Espinosa de los Monteros, Antonio
 Music, Guatemala, 102-03
 Music, Mexico, 104-07
- National Revolutionary Party, 322-24
- Oaxaca, 46, 319
 Obregón, Alvaro, 93, 183, 316
- Pan Americanism, 268-69
 Peace, international, 221-32, 301-10
 Penal legislation, 208-17
 Petroleum, 162, 170
 Posada, Guadalupe, 94
 Protestantism, 146-53
- Quetzalcoatl, 59-60
- Race prejudice, 178-83, 291-93
 Ramírez, Rafael, 111-23, 197-208
 Revolution, 25-26, 37-40, 93-94, 313-26
 Rivera, Diego, 88-94
 Roman Catholic Church, 9-10, 43-44; missionaries, 47-56, 89-90, 133-45; labor, 138-41; alcoholism, 141-43; persecution of, 322
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 273-4, 304-5
- Ruez, Roberto A. Esteva, see Esteva Ruez, Roberto A.
- Sáenz, Aarón, 255-62
 Sáenz, Moisés, 3-30
 Sahagún, Fray Bernardino de, 49-50
 San Antonio, Texas, 237-40
 Scott, James Brown, 308
 Sheffield, James R., 307
 Siedenbush, Frederic, 190-94
 Silver, 169-70
 Soto y Gama, Antonio Díaz, 177-84
 Spaniards, 9-10, 16-17, 22-23, 83-84, 89-91
 Spanish language, importance of, 291
 Students, 127-30
 Superstitions, 50-54
- Taft, William Howard, 304
 Tannenbaum, Frank, 185-87
 Tarahumaras, 197-98
 Tariff, 172-3
 Textiles, 97-101
 Toledano, Vicente Lombardo, 272-76
 Topchevsky, Morris, 46-47
 Trade, 171
 Trade unions, 185-87
 Treviño, Ricardo, 187-90
- United States, contrast with Mexico, 3-4, 35, 326; trade, 171; labor, 190-94; intervention, 225-28; claims, 294, 306-7
 University of Mexico, 124-27
 Urbina, Salvador, 288-300
- Valle, Rafael Heliodoro, 58-68
 Van Loon, Hendrik, 224-25
 Visas, 244-47
- Watson, Annie Clo, 235-40
 Winters, George H., 244-47

